



CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

The Unity of Scripture
WALTER R. ROEHRS

What Is a "Missionary," Anyway?
GRAEME M. ROSENAU

Brief Studies

Homiletics

Theological Observer

Book Review

VOL. XXXI

May 1960

No. 5

T
—
—

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Volume XXXI

May 1960

Number 5

Published by

THE LUTHERAN CHURCH—MISSOURI SYNOD

Edited by

THE FACULTY OF CONCORDIA SEMINARY
SAINT LOUIS, MISSOURI

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE
SAINT LOUIS, MISSOURI

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY is published monthly by Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis 18, Mo., to which all business correspondence is to be addressed. \$3.50 per annum, anywhere in the world, payable in advance. Second-class postage paid at St. Louis, Mo.

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Vol. XXXI

MAY 1960

No. 5

Editorial Comment	276
The Unity of Scripture. WALTER R. ROEHRS	277
What Is a "Missionary," Anyway? GRAEME M. ROSENAU	303
BRIEF STUDIES	309
HOMILETICS	312
THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER	318
BOOK REVIEW	323

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

VICTOR BARTLING, PAUL M. BRETSCHER

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER, MARTIN H. FRANZMANN

ALFRED O. FUERBRINGER, ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN

WALTER R. ROEHRS,* LEWIS W. SPITZ

GILBERT A. THIELE

* On leave of absence

*Address all communications to the Editorial Committee in care of
Victor Bartling, 801 De Mun Ave., St. Louis 5, Mo.*

Editorial Comment

In his instructive novel about the cure of souls entitled *The Hammer of God* (recently brought out in an excellent English translation by Augustana Book Concern of Rock Island, Ill.) Bishop Bo Giertz of Sweden touches one of his deep pastoral and episcopal concerns in a bit of dialog:

"But must we not, nevertheless, hold to a historical view of the Bible?" he asked.

"What is that?"

Torvik was amazed at the question. The old pastor answered it himself.

"There is room for anything and everything in that phrase. It can be pure rationalism, which considers everything in the Bible to be relative, uncertain, and extensible, so that the final result is that you need not agree at any point unless you wish to do so. The authority of the Bible is in that case rejected, and man himself, his reason, his conscience, his modern scientific spirit, and everything else that is blind and straying, has become the guiding star of religion. It can of course include some other things that are much finer and better, this historical view of the Bible. But as far as salvation is concerned, I do not think it matters whether one has a historical or an unhistorical view of the Bible. Everything depends on whether we have a *religious* view of the Bible."

Now it was Torvik's turn to ask, "And what is that?"

"That is faith in the Bible as the voice of God, so that if you read it to hear what God would say to you, you actually hear God speak. For my part, I have the simple belief that the Bible is exactly as God wanted it to be. That does not mean, perhaps, that every detail is set forth sys-

tematically for science, as in an academic treatise. But it means that every little detail has been given such a form that a human being who seeks salvation will be helped to find the truth." (Pp. 299 f.)

This journal has always shared Bishop Giertz's concern and has tried to foster the "*religious* view of the Bible," which must accompany all our Bible study, also the "historical method" properly understood. In this concern the March issue carried Prof. Martin H. Franzmann's "The Posture of the Interpreter." This article has been thankfully received by many readers. We have the same expectation with regard to the article on "The Unity of the Bible" by Prof. Walter R. Roehrs appearing in the present issue. From beginning to end it flows out of and leads to the "*religious* view of the Bible." Much of this material could well be adapted for use in Bible classes. We herewith acknowledge gratefully the permission granted by the Carey Kingsgate Press, London, to quote in this article from their publication *The Unity of the Bible*, by H. H. Rowley.

In the article "What is a 'Missionary,' Anyway?" a young worker on the home mission field seeks for himself and his co-workers a Bible-based "posture" of the missionary. We dedicate this article to the "1960" graduates of our seminaries who, whatever their specific assignment may be, must like all church workers function as missionaries, sent by Him who was sent by His Father. May the Sender reveal to them His powerful presence "all the days" of their missionary life.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

WALTER R. ROEHRS, professor, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.
GRAEME ROSENAU, missionary-pastor, Lake Arrowhead, Cal.

The Unity of Scripture

By WALTER R. ROEHRs

[ED. NOTE: This article was originally prepared for and read to the laymen, teachers, and pastors of the Northern Illinois District of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, assembled in convention at River Forest, Ill., June 1958.]

THE unity of Scripture is an article of faith. This unity is also an objective fact that exists apart from faith and does not become a fact merely when I believe it (existentialist theology). But it is more than an arithmetic problem. It is not a mere unit sum at which we arrive by adding a number of given parts and fractions into a whole. This means that it is more than the addition of demonstrable facts and figures. Only he who is at one with God has eyes not only to see the fact but also to understand the purpose and to experience the unifying power of the Scriptural Word. By means of that Word the Holy Spirit has put together his fractured life and has brought healing integration to its disunity and conflicts, the fightings and fears within and without. He knows that there is no longer division and disunity between him and God, for "God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself" (2 Cor. 5:19). At peace with God, he can integrate everything that pulled his life apart and disturbed its unity into an harmonious whole that radiates from one single controlling focus, for he says: "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me, and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me." (Gal. 2:20)

Our children are taught early in life that one cannot add two sheep and two cows.

Incommensurables cannot be added. This is the predicament of unbelief. The various parts of Scripture are made up of such incongruous parts as to defy addition into a unit total. It is only in the higher arithmetic of faith that human sin + the grace of God in Christ Jesus = salvation. But this is the sum total of Scripture. All its parts add up to it. That is its unity. The cross of Christ is the great plus sign of Scripture. It gives positive value to all the deadly negations of life. There are no elements of life so incongruous that it cannot add them together into a meaningful whole. The unbeliever cannot find this unity in Scripture. Even the words of the one verse John 3:16 do not for him add up to a coherent sum of meaning. But he whose life of contradictions and conflicts is put together by the cross finds in Scripture the united and unifying voice from beyond his predicament, the voice that brings healing and salvation.

I. THE UNITY OF SCRIPTURE IS WONDERFUL BECAUSE SO MANY DIVERSITIES ARE COMBINED IN IT

A. *In the Bible as a Whole*

The unity of Scripture is an article of faith. This also means that it is not something that we can or must bring about. It is a fact which we can only explore. And the more we do so, the more we marvel at the wonders of that unity. Let us begin by recalling briefly how manifold and variant the elements are that are combined in this unity.

When we have our Bible in our hands, it is held firmly together by the glue and the staples of the printer. But I need not

remind you that it did not fall from heaven neatly bound together in a book. God could have given it to us in that way, I suppose. But He chose a different way. Perhaps He did so that already thereby our Bible might be different and unique among the other so-called holy books of other religions. Their unity, if there is any, consists in this, that they are the finished product of a single author. The Koran, the bible of the Muslim, came into existence as the result of the labors of Mohammed. Nor are there any golden plates of revelation for our Bible like those that Joseph Smith claims to have found.

What a contrast in the Bible! Diversity seems to be the very stuff out of and by which it came to be. It did not come ready-made at a given point in a man's life or during the entire lifetime of a single man. Centuries elapsed between the composition of the first and the last of its component parts. Not one man but scores of men are the instruments of its revealed message. And what a motley crowd they are! From every walk of life they come, from all strata of society: Amos, the shepherd; Moses, trained in all the wisdom of Egypt; Isaiah of royal lineage; Micah the rustic; Ezekiel the priest; Ezra the scribe; Matthew the tax collector; Luke the physician; Peter the fisherman; Paul the Pharisee of the Pharisees.

And what a variety of personalities: Jeremiah the retiring introvert; Peter the blustering extrovert; Hosea the sensitive man; Ezekiel the self-contained and stalwart man; John the gentle and benign!

And when they write, it is not in the uniform style of a single holy man like Mohammed. Judged from a purely literary point of view the Bible exhibits the full range from matter-of-fact prose and even

pedestrian composition to an unequaled beauty of poetry and loftiness of expression.

Furthermore, the most varied types of literature are represented in this book. There is poetry, prose, oratory, history, law, parable, allegory, fable, proverb.

B. In the New Testament

What is true of the whole Bible also holds for its two major parts, the Old Testament and the New Testament. Each has its own peculiarities. Let us look at the New Testament first. A British New Testament scholar says in a recent book: "From a purely literary point of view the New Testament is vastly inferior to the Old Testament" (A. M. Hunter, *Introducing the New Testament*, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1945, p. 9). He goes on to say that from a literary angle "the New Testament is a literary hotchpotch. Here are all sorts of literary forms and specimens: four gospels, like biographies in some respects, in others quite unlike; a very mixed epistolary bag; finally a specimen of apocalyptic writing." (P. 113)

But the diversity does not end there. It extends to the presentation of the contents themselves. On the surface it might appear as if the various New Testament writers were discussing totally different things. In the first three gospels the subject seems to be "the kingdom of God"; in the epistles the dominant note is "being in Christ," an expression that occurs more than 150 times there; in the writings of John, "eternal life" (Hunter, p. 113). E. W. Parson (*The Religion of the New Testament*, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1939) makes these differences irreconcilable and considers a harmonized cross section of New Testament theology as an

impossible and arbitrary undertaking. He finds three distinct and incompatible strands: the religion of Jesus, the religion of the pre-Pauline Christians, the religion of Paul. So also E. S. Scott (*The Varieties of the New Testament Religion*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943), who finds these four opposing theologies: The primitive teaching, the Hellenistic Christianity, the religion of Paul, the rivals of Paul.

C. In the Old Testament

In the Old Testament there are likewise not only diversities of form, but its various parts set forth opposing ideas and concepts to the point where they appear to exclude one another as contradictory. We see this difference, e.g., in the Law on the one hand and in the prophets on the other. In the one instance we have the most stringent and detailed instructions regarding sacrifice and ceremony with the threat of dire punishment for their neglect. Some prophets on the other hand seem at first glance to inveigh against sacrifice as useless, yes, even as detrimental. Furthermore, the maxims of the so-called Wisdom Literature appear to be independent of both prophet and priest. In the opinion of some people these varieties also are irreconcilable. In his book *The Religious Pilgrimage of Israel* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947) I. G. Mathews maintains that it is possible to isolate no fewer than 14 different "religions" in the Old Testament. Robert C. Dentan asks: "What concord can there be between Proverbs and Amos; or between Leviticus and Jeremiah?" (*The Unity of the Old Testament*, "Interpretation, V [April 1951], 154)

There is also the difference of the Old

Testament and the New Testament, the revelation of promise and fulfillment, to which we shall refer later.

We have established these diversities not in order to pit them against one another but to call attention to the kind of unity that exists in Scripture. If all these various dabs of paint combine to give a single portrait, an artist of the most consummate skill must have directed the brush of the painters. If so many artists, ages apart, wielding small and great brushes, using bright and somber colors, sketching line and counterline, using media of every sort, produced a painting in which each contribution has its place, we marvel how unity could come about out of such diversity.

II. MANY EXPLANATIONS OF THE UNITY OF SCRIPTURE ARE NOT SATISFACTORY

The Revived Interest in Finding a Unifying Principle

Biblical scholarship in recent years has again shown an interest in the unity of the Bible. This movement is a reaction to the results of an atomizing process that stressed the diversities to the point where no meaning could be found in its parts. Particularly since Wellhausen, critical scholars had done a thorough job of taking the Bible apart. There it lay like so many pieces of a jigsaw puzzle that no longer would fit into a meaningful pattern: a verse here by one author, a half-verse there by another; a section from one tradition, another from an opposite point of view. To use another illustration, it was felt that the time had come that all the king's horses and all the king's men should put humpty-dumpty together again.

This revival of reassembling the diversi-

ties that had been established is evident in the appearance of a whole spate of books with such titles as *The Unity of the Bible*, *The Relevance of the Bible*, *The Unity of the Old Testament*, *The Unity of the New Testament*. H. H. Rowley says on the first page of his book (*The Unity of the Bible*, London: Carey Kingsgate Press, 1953): "The emphasis then was predominantly on the diversity of the Bible, and such a title as that of the present book would have involved some suspicion that the author was an out-of-date obscurantist."

What this author says applies to another shift of emphasis in recent years. It is again respectable for Old Testament scholars to speak of a theology of the Old Testament. Under the spell of research into the environment in which the Bible originated, the best term that could be found to describe its contents was not the theology of the Old Testament but the religion of the Jews. It was a religion, perhaps with some points of difference from that of primitive peoples of old but in the main very much like it. Now books are appearing again that unblushingly bear the title *The Theology of the Old Testament*. This theology, furthermore, is linked with the revelation found in the New Testament. And so there are also modern books with the title *The Old Testament in the New Testament* (R. V. G. Tasker, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1947) or entitled *According to the Scriptures*, the phrase that Paul uses in 1 Cor. 15 to assert that the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus were foretold in the Old Testament (C. H. Dodd, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953). Summing up the Haskell Lectures of 1949 by G. Ernest Wright, Floyd V. Filson says: "We nowhere find a real

parallel to the Bible. . . . The things that are vital and determinative in the Bible we do not get from archaeology, or from literary study any essential parallels or any basic dependence on environmental forces. Moreover it is precisely in these distinctive features that the kinship between the Testaments makes itself felt." ("The Unity of the Bible," *Interpretation*, V [April 1951], 138)

We can only applaud this change of emphasis. But we must add that in most instances it is only that: a change of emphasis. It has not always resulted in establishing a unity of the Bible which accounts for its diversity on its own terms and claims. Some parts remain archaeological curiosities, which continue to be used because they agree with prevailing religious ideas; others are rejected for the same reason.

A. *The Unity of a Common National and Cultural Background*. — In viewing the Bible as a whole we find, first of all, human and natural factors that this body of literature has in common and that give it a character all its own. The unity of the Bible may be found in this, that "its several books are all the production of one and the same people or nation, written in the national language that was current and all exhibiting the distinguishing marks of the national genius" (Dentan, p. 155). This observation applies particularly to the Old Testament. National traits are evident throughout and set this literature off in a class by itself. We need only compare it with Roman and Greek thought, the Hebrew spirit with the Greek spirit, to notice the difference. "There is the well-known interest in the concrete as opposed to the abstract; a concern for events rather than

for ideas; a vigor and intensity of style which contrasts markedly with the diffuseness and relaxed spirit of the Greeks; the absence of mythology; a lack of concern with cultural, literary, and aesthetic values as such and a corresponding passion for religious and moral values" (Dentan, p.155). These observations have merit. The Hebrew language moves in concrete terms and did not develop a vocabulary to express abstractions. When the New Testament substitutes Greek words for these Old Testament terms, the dictionary to use in determining their basic meaning is first of all the Old Testament. It is also true that the concreteness of the Hebrews is a safeguard against degrading theology into a philosophic or a mystic system of abstract ideas. It seems safe to say that you can be quite sure that your theology is on the right road if you can translate it into Hebrew. This is not to say that only Hebrew categories of thought and language forms are adequate to express the truth of revealed religion. But it is without doubt providential that the language of the Old Testament is what it is as a vehicle of revelation and that God used it also for this specific reason.

But the Old Testament is more than a compendium of a national literature that is characteristically Hebraic. In an anthology of all ancient Greek authors, e.g., there is nothing remotely to compare with the cohesion of thought and singleness of purpose displayed by all Biblical writers. Therefore "past generations . . . bound all these books, apparently so heterogenous, into a single volume and called it not 'Ancient Hebrew literature'—to borrow the title given the Old Testament in the *Everyman's Library* edition—but 'The

Bible' or 'The Old Testament,' . . . convinced that there was something in this literature which set it apart from all other writings and which made it possible to speak of it collectively as *hai graphai* (the Scriptures)." (Dentan, p.154)

B. *The Unity Achieved by Elimination.*
—Another very unsatisfactory attempt to maintain or to salvage a unified viewpoint limits the acceptable parts of the Bible to one of its major divisions, the Old Testament or the New Testament. Judaism can find no unity between the Old Testament and the New Testament and therefore rejects the New Testament as a disparate element in its religion. Some Christians in effect do the same thing. This is true of the extreme "Jesus of history" school, which strips away the account and portrayal of our Lord as we have it in the New Testament and finds a Jesus that bears only the slightest resemblance to the Jesus of the gospels. There is in effect no New Testament left.

The Old Testament is likewise removed by some as an incongruous element that defies assimilation into a single pattern. Already Marcion in the second century of the Christian era found the God of the Old Testament so different from the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ that he felt constrained to repudiate the whole Old Testament. The Nazis of Germany discarded it because it disturbed their fantasy of racial purity and unity. G. E. Phillips in *The Old Testament in the World Church* (London: The Lutterworth Press, 1942) reports that some foreign missionaries also think they would fare better if the Old Testament were eliminated. They feel that it would be "better to bring the nations to the New Testament and to

Christ by building on the native religions and their writings rather than by using the Old Testament as the essential basis for understanding the New Testament" (cited by Floyd V. Filson, *Interpretation*, V [April 1951] 136). Filson (p. 149) also quotes Rudolf Bultmann as saying: "For Christian faith, the Old Testament is no longer revelation as it was and is for the Jews. Israel's history is not revelational history for Christian faith" (*Glauben und Verstehen: Gesammelte Aufsätze*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1954, pp. 333 f.). Finally there may be, in effect, a surrender of the Old Testament to Judaism in the expression "the Judaeo-Christian tradition." This phrase can be understood correctly. But it also may be used to imply that we really do not need the New Testament to complete the Old Testament and that Judaism and its rejection of Christ are justified.

C. *The Unity of the Ethics of the Bible.*

— It is not enough, furthermore, to seek the unity of the Bible merely in its ethical teaching. For a time many Old Testament scholars found its abiding and central value in the social justice and uprightness as proclaimed by the eighth century prophets and onward: Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah. In this phase of the Old Testament they recognized flesh of their flesh and bone of their bone. After trekking through the arid and waste places of irrelevant patriarchal history and the even more meaningless details of Israel's provisions for worship, they felt that in the ethical teaching of the prophets they had come upon springs of living waters. And this aspect also supplied the basis for a unity of the Old Testament with the New Testament. It is summed up in the Golden Rule and

achieves new beauty and perfection in the great Exemplar of the good life. But such an eclectic procedure uses the Bible only to the extent that it finds support for its subjective fancy and does not do justice to its message as a whole.

It is gratifying to note that such an emphasis on one strand of Biblical teaching to the neglect of other basic elements is not so prominent today. Perhaps the shattering experience of two world wars has disillusioned those who believed that men can be made better merely by holding before them the precepts and the ideal of moral behavior. A British scholar who forthrightly states that he is no longer the liberal theologian of his early career says: "If the peculiar virtue of the New Testament lies in its ethics, clearly three-fourths of it must be regarded as irrelevant. . . . To remove all but ethics is like Hamlet with the Prince of Denmark left out." (Hunter, p. 10)

D. *The Unity in Man's Ability to Respond to God's Revelation.* — There is another view of the unity of Scripture which proves to be unsatisfactory because it fails to integrate all of its parts into an acceptable whole. It says indeed: "Yes, the whole Bible belongs together because it has its origin in God," but it adds: "It is, however, authoritative for us only after those parts that represent imperfections of earlier stages in its development have been sloughed off and discarded. It becomes progressively more reliable and valid as its writers were able better to understand and transmit what God was saying." This is the position of many who have broken with the old liberalism and want to be constructive in their Biblical studies rather than atomistic and destructive.

To their credit it should be said that they do not hold that the Bible represents the growth and development merely of the human spirit. What we have in the Bible is more than an evolutionary process of the human mind or intellect. There is more involved than the development of the spirit of man which enabled him to learn from the mistakes of his forebears, to climb step by step to greater heights, and thus by his own ingenuity to wrest from the heavens the secrets of the unknown. Man, they say, may be able to launch a satellite today because he is the heir of countless scientific contributions of others who have gone before. It is not so in the realm of man's spirit. No matter how high his spirit attempts to fly, it cannot penetrate the myteries of what God is, what man is in the sight of God, and what the relationship of God to man is. In other words, they confidently assert that if man is to discern spiritual things, God must reveal them to him. And He has done so; He has miraculously influenced and energized and vitalized the spirit of men in such a way that they became the instruments of His revelation. They were inspired. And the record of what they relayed from God to man is the Bible — it is all one because the same God spoke through the prophets of the Old Testament and the evangelists and the apostles of the New Testament.

Unfortunately this is not the whole story. We cannot dip into the Bible, into this unit product of God's inspiration indiscriminately, they say, and draw from it the pure water of God's revelation. Not all parts of the Bible are of equal value; in fact, there are parts that contradict everything that God is and that are wholly unworthy of Him. How does this come about?

Permit me to give the explanation of this anomaly by one of the most outstanding and prolific Old Testament scholars of Great Britain, H. H. Rowley. In many respects he represents the best in the modern reaction to a previous negative and purely humanistic point of view. He believes that the writers of the Bible are inspired. In his book *The Unity of the Bible* (1953) he insists in a whole chapter that God has spoken so clearly in the Bible that he can formulate authoritative doctrines on the sacraments. He can say: "It [the Bible] nowhere tells how men by the exercise of their minds wrested the secrets of life and of the universe from God, but how God laid hold of them and revealed Himself through them" (p. 8). "[But] here [in the Bible] the continuing thread that gives unity to the record is the divine element. The unity is not the unity of the spirit of Israel and of the Church but the unity of the divine revelation given in the context of history and through the medium of human personality" (pp. 15 f.). So far so good. We agree also when he says: "The kind of unity which the writer sees in the Bible is a dynamic unity and not a static unity." He recognizes an unfolding of divine truth and in particular a development from the Old Testament to the New Testament. "Yet it is not to be supposed that development was brought about by the unfolding of the human spirit through the mere passage of time." (P. 7)

What then is the reason for a unity with exceptions? The fault is not on God's side, it is said. He, indeed, revealed Himself in the perfection of His truth. "What limited the revelation was not God's willingness to give, but man's capacity to receive" (p. 34). "God being personal cannot adequately reveal Himself save through personality and

can only reveal Himself perfectly in perfect personality. That is why the incarnation was necessary for the whole revelation of God" (p. 25). Jesus Christ alone is the perfect personality that could transmit to men an undistorted picture of God and His revelation to men. So, it is maintained (p. 14), "Christians recognize that whatever is alien to the Spirit of Christ and His revelation of God [in Scripture] has no validity for them."

The writers of the Old Testament particularly were not such perfect personalities. They did not understand entirely what God was saying to them and naturally could not convey it without some distortion to others. Because inspiration was not mechanical so as to entail "the suspension of human personality," the message of the Bible is "colored by the glass through which it passes" (p. 36). Or to use a different picture, God poured the pure water of His revelation into a vessel that had no capacity for its full meaning. It is like trying to pour the contents of a quart bottle into a pint bottle. Besides this the pint bottle was not clean. It contained impurities, the impurities of human frailty. And so the pure water is there only in part and contaminated and adulterated with unwholesome debris.

Applying this to the Bible, we find, says Rowley, "some conceptions of God [in the Old Testament] which fall below the standards of the highest even in the Old Testament," to say nothing of the New Testament, and "it cannot be said that the God who revealed Himself deliberately gave men false ideas about Himself" (p. 14). In some passages of the Old Testament the agents of inspiration are said to show how incapable they were of reproducing the picture of God that He

had shown them. It is an allegedly faulty, yea, even an ugly caricature of God, who is not the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. The writer of the Book of Samuel, for example, still thinks of God as an ogre who delights in the wholesale murder of the Amalekites and puts these words into God's mouth: "Now go and smite Amalek and utterly destroy all that they have and spare them not; but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass" (1 Sam. 15:2). Or the writer of Kings has the conception of a God who deliberately misleads people into error:

And the Lord said unto him, Wherewith? And he said, I will go forth, and I will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And he said, Thou shalt persuade him and prevail also. Go forth and do so. Now therefore, behold, the Lord hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these thy prophets, and the Lord hath spoken evil concerning thee. (1 Kings 22:22 f.)

These examples can be multiplied. (Cf. 2 Sam. 21:1-14; Gen. 18; the imprecatory psalms.)

So, they say, we can account for inspiration only if it is dynamic in this sense and not static. Learning from the previous and continued revelation of God, later inspired men were able to absorb more fully what God was saying. The final touchstone of what is valid is the Word made flesh, in whom dwelt all the fullness of the God-head bodily. There is a unity of the Bible, it is the result of God's revelation, but God was hampered and frustrated by the frailties of men so that He could not give us so unified a message that it does not require a sloughing off of misunderstandings on the part of men.

But Scripture itself gives no support to such a theory of inspiration. It does not establish its unity on the basis that only those parts that are judged good belong together while other parts must be rejected. At this point we might mention that the view that all of Scripture is valid is often called a theory — and a mechanical one at that — of inspiration. We must be satisfied, it is said, to accept that the Bible is the Word of God but must not go beyond that point to describe how this inspiration came about. The moment we do that we are becoming involved in a mere theory of inspiration, which has not support in Scripture itself. But we submit the view of the unity of the Bible that we have just described and rejected and ask: Is it not also based on a theory of inspiration? Clearly there are two theoretical assumptions involved. The first consists in the unproved axiom that God can only reveal Himself through a personality. We look in vain in Scripture for such a restriction of God's power. The second axiom also imposes limits on God by the theory — and it is only that — that God was frustrated in revealing Himself by the inadequacy of the instruments of inspiration. Because they were imperfect God was handicapped and could not get through to men with His message. Is this the God who spoke and by His Word brought the universe into existence? Another parallel may be drawn from the incarnation itself. All the sons of Adam are tainted and wholly inadequate instruments for God in the flesh. But the second Adam is such a perfect man. God had a way to become man without man's sin. The parallel to Scripture is drawn in Heb. 1:1: "God, who spoke through His Son, also spoke in times past to the fathers

by the prophets." In neither case is He frustrated by the impossible. When He speaks, He will be heard, all theories about God notwithstanding.

When we say that God succeeded in revealing Himself through His chosen instruments we are not attempting to explain a miracle or to bolster faith in a miracle by intellectual proof. Inspiration is a miracle, and the moment we explain it, it is no longer a miracle. I cannot explain the process by which the miracles of our Lord came to pass. I can only stand in awe and reverence before this display of divine power. In the same way I do not understand, and I should never claim to be able to understand and to explain, the process of inspiration. How fallible men were able to speak the infallible truths of God is a miracle that I can only accept because by the power of the same divine Spirit the miracle of faith has been wrought in my heart by that Word. And finally it should be added that I can get a correct understanding of God's perfect revelation in and through Christ only as God enabled men to give me a perfect account of Him and His acts of salvation. It is a false contrast to assert that "revelation is by action rather than words, by deeds rather than by doctrine" (Hunter, p. 4). Goethe is supposed to have said: "The highest cannot be spoken, it can only be acted." But in Scripture the highest has been acted, and it has been spoken.

I have dwelt a little longer on this explanation of the unity of Scripture for two reasons. We are happy to note, on the one hand, that recognized Biblical scholars again do not shun the expression "inspiration" as if it were a nasty word. It is true, of course, that we still have such

liberals about us as say, for example: "The search for unity goes on. We would be false to our trust to take as absolutely final the New Testament deductions on the meaning of the death of Jesus. . . . We must make our own appraisal of it . . ." (Paul E. Davies, "Unity and Variety in the New Testament," *Interpretation*, V [April 1951], 185). On the other hand, we must hasten to add that it is only an old theory of a partial inspiration in a new form which Rowley presents, and this theory cannot account for the unity of the Scriptures by saying: "The underlying unity is of greater significance than the things on which they are divided." (Rowley, p. 8)

Our discussion so far has been for the most part negative. But I hope that it will serve the positive purpose of our seeing more clearly what a wondrous unity amid diversity exists in the Bible when we now explore some of the more basic aspects of that unity.

III. THE UNITY OF SCRIPTURE COMBINES THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE NEW TESTAMENT

The two major component parts of our Bible are known as the Old Testament and the New Testament. Regarding the term "testament" to designate these divisions Tasker says the following:

It is unfortunate that the two parts of the Holy Bible should be called the Old and New *Testaments*. As is well known, the name "Testament" came into the English versions from the Latin Bible, where the word *testamentum* is used to translate a Greek word, which usually means "last will or testament," but which was used in the Greek version of the Old Testament known as the Septuagint to translate the Hebrew word meaning "covenant." Neither

testamentum nor its English equivalent "testament" conveys the idea of covenant; yet the main theme of the Bible is the covenant-relationship between God and man, a relationship which was initiated by God for the reconciliation of sinful man to Himself. First He entered into a covenant-relationship with the Israelites, whom He called out of Egypt for the special purpose of revealing through them His purposes for mankind; and later in the person of His incarnate Son He inaugurated a new covenant with the new Israel. The membership of this new Israel consisted of all who accepted Jesus both as the Christ, who fulfilled the prophecies made to the old Israel, and as the Saviour, who by His death and resurrection had won salvation for all mankind. Instead therefore of speaking of the Old and New Testaments we should strictly speak of the Books of the Old and New Covenants. The makers of the Revised Version altered "testament" to "covenant" in the text, but retain it in the titles. [R. V. G. Tasker, *The Old Testament in the New Testament*, p. 13]

But even when we understand the term "testament" properly as a designation for each of the two parts of the Bible, the fact remains that they are distinguishable parts and are distinguished from each other by the contrasting modifiers "old" and "new." This distinction is made in the Bible itself. The New Testament speaks of "reading the Old Testament" (2 Cor. 3:14), and the Old Testament speaks of a coming "new covenant." (Jer. 31:31)

The manner in which unity arises out of these two diverse parts is truly marvelous. It is not a synthetic and mechanical union but one of inner growth and fulfillment.

It is not a unity of an artificial identification; rather it is the unity of integration into one historical process, into one total

and progressive revelation. The history of creation and the history of redemption are united into one indivisible whole because creation and redemption form one line of divine action flowing from God's goodness through God's Word in the world. [Quentin Lauer, "The Hebrew Point of View," *Theology Digest*, VI (Spring 1958), 105]

We marvel at this unity because it involves a paradox. There is the full yea and amen to the Old Testament in the New and at the same time just as emphatic a nay to pages and pages of Old Testament provisions and prescriptions. Again, there is not a no to the Old Testament in the New Testament which discards it as being old and useless and giving way to something that takes its place. There is rather in the newness of the New Testament a continuity with the Old which the New Testament affirms as valid and as still relevant. It is the kind of unity that cannot be the invention of the human mind. It passes human understanding.

A. *Outward Different Circumstances*

Before we directly take up the links that unite the Old and the New Testament, we want to pause for a moment to recall some of the elements of diversity in each that are combined in this unity.

There is, first of all, the very real difference in the outward circumstances. When we hold our Bible in our hands we may overlook the fact that there was a time when there was no Bible at all. We are not told, e.g., that God had provided a Scripture, a written message of His way of salvation, for Abraham and the patriarchs. And yet Abraham was saved by faith, and the New Testament affirms this fact.

Furthermore, when God proceeded to

give a written Word to the people of old that we now call the Old Testament, He apparently took His time about it — centuries of time, a millennium of time. The circumstances also are as varied as the time is long: in the desert when Israel was an unorganized horde of tribes; in Palestine when the people of God were in possession of the Land of Promise; during the time of the kings when one powerful empire of the ancient world after another rose and fell and in their rise and fall were brought into contact with Israel; in the exile when the kingdom of David had fallen and Israel was scattered among the Gentiles; in the restoration from the exile although Israel was still under the sway and the control of a foreign empire.

By contrast think of the New Testament. Here there were not hundreds of years involved but merely a few decades. In this short time the inspired writers completed their task and all of it in the outward uniformity of the one rule of Rome, the Pax Romana.

The point that we want to make is that the one testament grew out of the most diverse conditions during centuries of outward change, and the New Testament came into existence in a uniform situation of one and the same generation. But these differences of circumstances in each case do not result in a clash of the Old Testament with the New Testament. If these two parts form a unity out of such diversity of circumstances, can the explanation be found in natural causes? What a miracle of unity in diversity!

B. *The Completeness of Both and the Incompleteness of Each Without the Other*

The marvel of this unity grows when we turn from these outward diversities and

look at the content and purpose of each testament. Each is at the same time complete and incomplete in itself. Let us look at each testament from this point of view.

First of all, the Old Testament can be said to be complete and incomplete by itself. We must remember again that there was a time when there was no New Testament. How complete in itself was the Old Testament without the New Testament? Furthermore, we must also recall that it took centuries before the Old Testament was completed. There is not only a passing of time, but in the Old Testament itself there is a progressive unfolding of God's plan of salvation. We need only to cite one example. Isaiah 53, speaking of the vicarious suffering of the Servant of the Lord, is not found in Genesis 3, where the more general promise of a woman's Seed is recorded. There is, then, some justification for the question: Was the Old Testament at every stage of its coming into existence complete in itself?

Furthermore, the Old Testament was all that Israel had when it finally was finished. Was it complete to teach the way of salvation? The answer is, of course, yes. We can be certain that the people of Isaiah's time knew how to be saved. It was by faith in the forgiving mercies of God and not by the works of the law. There were, indeed, many laws. But from the beginning God made two things clear. First, salvation did not come by a mechanical or outward observance of a ritual and the cultic laws. These laws were not, as in the religions all around Israel, magical formulae whose mere recitation automatically gave man control over God and put Him under obligation to man. Second, the keeping of the Law did not produce salvation.

The Old Testament religion was not one of good works by which God's favor could be procured. Salvation was something that God gave to undeserving, sinful people. "As Paul noted, the thread of faith runs through its story even in the Pentateuchal narratives. . . . Thus back of the Law and deeper than the Law are God's choice of Israel, His gracious action, and the note of faith" (Floyd V. Filson, "The Unity of the Old and New Testaments," *Interpretation*, V [April 1951], 142). At every stage, then, as the Old Testament grew book by book and when it was completed, nothing was lacking to teach men how to be saved.

But standing by itself the Old Testament is also incomplete in a real sense. It looks forward to a completion of God's great acts of redemption begun in Israel. Its whole history is open to the future. It is history, real history, but there is in all of it, explicitly or implicitly, what the Germans call *Zielstrebigkeit*—a consciousness of not having attained but a pressing forward to a goal still to be reached. There is a provisional character about it that looks to the future for its validation. I want to stress the point that this expectation of greater things to come is found not only in those passages that we call Messianic prophecies. The whole Old Testament is pregnant with this anticipation. It is awaiting the completion of what God has begun (cf. the *Benedictus*).

On the other hand, to the Christian the Old Testament is incomplete, its major tensions are never really resolved, the time to which it points is not realized, its manifold diversities are never sufficiently gathered into a unifying center (cf. however Second Isaiah), the dynamic quality of the prophetic proclamation never reaches a culmination, the kingship of God is never

radically present, the hour of the ἐφάπαξ is never struck. . . .

The early Christians were profoundly aware of the newness of the revelation in Jesus as the Christ; like the men at Qumran they had been waiting for "the coming of the new." But this category of newness is itself drawn from the Old Testament, as the New Testament records clearly affirm: new Exodus, new covenant, new creation, new redemption, and indeed, the new Adam, new Moses, and new Elijah. Again, the New Testament appropriates all the themes and motifs I have been describing and refashions them for its own purpose. [James Muilenburg, "Problems in Biblical Hermeneutics," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXVII (March 1958), 21, 24]

The Old Testament is complete; the Old Testament is incomplete. Both statements are true. And their very contrary nature is what produces the unity. Passing strange indeed! But the same kind of a remarkable unity is found also when we turn to the New Testament. It, too, is complete and incomplete at the same time.

It certainly is complete. It has written over all its pages the glorious message from the cross: It is finished. The goal has been reached. Nothing remains to be done for man's salvation. In Christ Jesus all the promises of God find their yea and amen. In the events of the New Testament we have God's signature of finality. Once for all times, all times are fulfilled. What was yesterday, what is today, and what comes tomorrow stands still in the completion of God's eternal plan of salvation. Here the incompleteness of the Old Testament is complete. I need not spell this out in detail. We know and have the Gospel of the perfected redemption through Jesus Christ. Blessed be His holy name!

And yet the New Testament is also not complete by itself in a real sense. The New Testament, first of all, is not complete without the Old Testament. It needs the Old Testament. Without the Old Testament the New Testament would be like a tree that has no roots, like a house that has no foundation.

It is on the basis of the Old Testament that we fully understand the New Testament. We might be tempted to think that the only value of the Old Testament for the New Testament lies in the fact that here we have the evidence that God has kept His promises. The New Testament indeed supplies that evidence. But God's faithfulness to His promises is also taught in the New Testament itself. (Cf. Rom. 11:29; 3:3)

When my uncle writes me a letter and promises me a check of \$5,000, I am happy in anticipation, and I am sure that I shall receive this gift because I know that he is a man of his word. Soon another letter comes which contains the check. Now that I have the check, why make much of the first letter? I may for sentimental reasons tie the letter up with a pretty ribbon, wrap it up with my souvenirs, and keep it in a drawer with other keepsakes. To put it differently, if the New Testament says merely in plain language what the Old Testament says in strange hieroglyphics, why bother about the Old Testament's cryptic and mysteriously strange sayings?

But the dependence of the New Testament upon the Old Testament for its completeness is far greater than that. The New Testament needs the Old Testament for an understanding of its own message.

This help from the Old Testament, however, is not merely an outward or literal dependence of the one on the other. We

might refer to Milton's *Paradise Lost*. This poetic masterpiece is so full of allusions to ancient mythology that it is unintelligible without some knowledge of that mythology. In the same way it is, indeed, true that the New Testament constantly refers to characters, events, and institutions of the Old Testament. Without the Old Testament we should be at a loss to understand these allusions. But that is only a part of the situation. The New Testament writers couch their message in Old Testament language and terms not merely because they were familiar with the literature of the Old Testament and because this literature was the best known in the world in which they lived. It was not merely an accident of time and place, therefore, that the New Testament writers were familiar with this literature and dipped into it for literary embellishment and forms of expression. Milton may not be intelligible without ancient mythology. But ancient mythology does not need Milton. In the Bible it is different. Neither the Old Testament nor the New Testament is fully clear without the other. (Cf. Rowley, pp. 93 f.)

We need the Old Testament to understand what has been fulfilled in the New Testament. Without the basis of the Old Testament it has been possible to present a picture of Jesus of Nazareth that is wholly a caricature of Him. Rowley in his book *The Relevance of the Bible* (London: James Clarke and Company, 1941), p. 78, says: "Christianity is not based on myth or speculation; it is not a philosophy or a cultus alone." He goes on to say: "It is rooted in history. From the soil of Judaism Christianity sprang, and neither Christ nor His teachings can be understood, save in relation to the Old Testament. He [Jesus]

was born a Jew because the whole history of Israel was a preparation for Him and because the religion of Judaism alone provided the inheritance He needed."

Just one more area in which the Old Testament prevents a false interpretation of the New Testament. No one who takes the Old Testament seriously can let Christianity degenerate into "an amiable sentimentality" such as we have in the sweet and utopian optimism of a Norman Vincent Peale (cf. the German *der liebe Gott*).

Finally, the New Testament is incomplete also in the same way that the Old Testament looked beyond itself to a fulfillment. The kingdom of God is complete here and now, but it is also the object of our expectation and hope. The New Testament expresses a longing for its consummation. To that extent our faith, even from the vantage point of the New Testament, is still an Old Testament advent faith based on promises, the promises of an inheritance in light. The Old Testament already knew about these final things, but the end has not come in its finality with the message of fulfillment in the New Testament. And in that sense and to that extent the New Testament does not record the complete realization of Old Testament hopes and expectations.

We are often asked how much of the New Testament fulfillment the people of the Old Testament understood. It is difficult to answer this question precisely. We get impatient with the obtuseness of even the disciples who had the Old Testament Scripture and who, even after three years of instruction by our Lord from the Old Testament, still "understood none of these things," so that Peter, for example, tried to dissuade Jesus from walking the way of the cross.

What did the Jews of earlier centuries know and understand? I am sure we can say that by God's grace they were saved by faith in God's promise of salvation from sin. As a parallel we might think of ourselves awaiting the fulfillment of God's promises in the final day. We have all we need to know to be certain that this promised day will come and that it will usher in our eternal glory. I am also convinced, however, that when the final trumpet sound forth, some things will happen in a way different from what I had expected on the basis of my understanding of these promises. In fact, their full meaning is beyond my comprehension this side of their fulfillment. So, I am sure, was Israel's faith. The fact of its redemption from sin was unmistakably sure, while Israel's failure to understand the details of the "how" and "when" did not vitiate or destroy their faith. So says Peter: "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you, searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ, which was in them, did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow." (1 Peter 1:10, 11)

C. *Some General Aspects of the Unity of the Old and New Testaments*

We have so far stressed the diverse elements in each of the two great divisions of the Bible that in a purely human product and development would and could not unite to form a unity. A book the two parts of which come into existence under such widely different outward circumstances of time and place, a book of which each part is complete and yet incomplete in itself, would defy any attempt to unify

its parts into an harmonious whole. But what is not true of other literary productions is gloriously true in the case of the Old Testament and the New Testament which constitute Holy Scripture. So we proceed to look for this unity and to see how it manifests itself.

There are various levels on which this unity of the Old and New Testaments becomes apparent. As we have pointed out, even a materialist can recognize a "certain historico-cultural continuum in ancient Palestine which threads its way through this vast complex material from beginning to end" (J. Stanley Glen, "Jesus Christ and the Unity of the Bible," *Interpretation*, V [July 1951], 260). But he who has the eyes of faith recognizes elements of unity of a far more basic, decisive, and fundamental character. As we look at these elements, we will begin with some wider circles of unity that revolve about a common core before we look at the center itself from which all these circles radiate.

1. *The Common Pattern of Revelation.*

—As the first of these general aspects of unity we note that in both the Old and the New Testament we have a common pattern of revelation. Rowley describes it as follows:

It will be remembered that it has not been argued above that the uniqueness of the Biblical revelation is to be found in its mediation through history, or in its mediation through prophetic personality. It is in the structure of the combination of both that the uniqueness lies. Moses claimed that by Divine initiative he was sent to deliver Israel. Though he promised deliverance he could not effect it by human power, and it was not to the achievement of freedom by Israel's own efforts that he summoned them. It was to

faith in his promise that he called them, and then deliverance was achieved by forces beyond his and their control. His promise was fulfilled by circumstances, and his claim to have spoken in the name of God was vindicated in history. No intelligent anticipation could offer the explanation, and the vindicating circumstances can no more explain his prior faith and promise than his prior faith and promise can explain the vindicating circumstances.

In the New Testament we find that our Lord appears before men with claims and promises. To examine them all is unnecessary. Suffice it to say that He believed that His work was of wide and enduring importance to men, and that His death would be of unique significance and power. If He was no more than a village carpenter and His word arose from no deeper source than His own heart, and if His claim that he delivered the word of God Who had spoken through Moses was false, then there could be no power in that word to effect its own fulfillment. Yet it has undeniably been fulfilled, and whether we like it or not the fact remains that His word has been of uniquely enduring importance to men, and His death has proved the uniqueness of its power in the experience of men. His confidence could not of itself give power if it were falsely based, and it is quite impossible to explain His confidence from its subsequent vindication. The vindication was given in verifiable history, and there is precisely the same evidence for the hand of God in this complex of personality and event, as there was in that of the period of the Exodus. [H. H. Rowley, *The Unity of the Bible*, pp. 97, 98]

That the new pattern is not a mere repetition of the old in its promise and achievement we shall stress later.

2. *The Same Content of Revelation.*—

Besides this general pattern of revelation we also find the same content of revelation. We do not have time now to trace this agreement in detail, nor do we at this point want to begin at the center and work to the circumference of this unity circle and see how all that the Bible has to say runs together into this center like so many radii of a circle. We shall content ourselves with mentioning only two teachings that lie within the orbit of Scripture: God and man. Perhaps it would be better to put it this way: What does the Old Testament and the New Testament say about God and man's relationship to Him?

In the first place we want to stress again that it is not true that the Old Testament knows of a God who makes the keeping of the Law the condition of man's becoming acceptable to God, while the New Testament has a God who does everything Himself that man may be united with Him. In other words, it is an oversimplification to speak of the Old Testament as the religion of the Law and the New Testament as a religion of grace, or that the Old Testament contains the Law and the New Testament the Gospel. If that were the case, there would be no unity between the Testaments in an area of its most basic concern, and then there might be considerable justification for the abandonment of the Old Testament on the mission field by the missionaries and by people in general. Nor is it true that the God of the Old Testament was satisfied with the outward deed of complying with the Law and that the New Testament is the religion of the heart.

We can only sketch the unified view of God and His relationship to man in both

the Old and New Testaments. There is a perfect agreement in all of Scripture in proclaiming the "otherness," or transcendence, of God. God is not nature, and nature is not God. A wide gulf separates God and man whom He created. This distinction of creature and Creator, however, became a tragic and disastrous cleavage when man became unlike God in that which is the sum total of all of His attributes: His holiness. It is the sin of fallen man that is in constant and absolute contradiction to the holy God. Now men must cry out as did the men of Bethshemesh (1 Sam. 6:20): "Who is able to stand before the Lord, this holy God?" The presence of this holiness is now a consuming fire. Isaiah, who heard the praises of God's holiness sung by the seraphim, exclaims: "Woe is me, for I am undone; for I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell among a people of unclean lips; for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts" (Is. 6:3). Yet the holy God demands holiness of men. "Ye shall be holy; for I, the Lord, your God, am holy." (Lev. 19:2 etc.)

The God of the New Testament is no less holy. Jesus addressed God as Holy Father (John 17:11). And the demand for holiness on the part of man is no less stringent. "But as He which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation" (1 Peter 1:15). "He hath chosen us in Him that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love." (Eph. 1:4; cf. Col. 1:22; 1 Cor. 3:16 f.; Heb. 12:10)

The God of the Old and New Testaments is also a loving God. In the Old Testament He says: "It was not because you were more numerous than other people that the Lord set His heart on you and

chose you, but because the Lord loved you" (Deut. 7:7 f.). His prophets say: "With an everlasting love have I loved thee; therefore have I drawn thee with loving-kindness" (Jer. 31:3). "When Israel was a child, I loved him and called My son out of Egypt" (Hos. 11:1). "The loving-kindness of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear Him." (Ps. 103:17)

One short sentence from the New Testament will suffice: "God is Love" (1 John 4:8, 16). And if the term "Father" is our Lord's characteristic term for God and the name by which He teaches us to address Him, so in the Old Testament we read: "Thou, O Lord, art our Father, our Redeemer, from everlasting is Thy name" (Is. 63:16). "Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him" (Ps. 103:13). "And I said, Ye shall call Me Father and shall not turn away from following Me" (Jer. 3:19). (Cf. H. H. Rowley, *Relevance of the Bible*, p. 130)

We hear the anguish and the disappointment of unrequited love when Jesus speaks tearful words over Jerusalem: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered thy children together as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not" (Luke 13:34; cf. 19:42). We hear the same thing earlier in the prophet Hosea: "How shall I give thee up, Ephraim? . . . Mine heart is turned within Me, My repentings [compassions] are kindled together." (Hos. 11:8; cf. Hos. 11:1 ff.; Jer. 2:3)

The God of the Bible does not remain aloof in the transcendence of His deity. He is "self-communicating." In the Old Testament we find the expression "Thus saith the Lord" or its equivalent more than

300 times. The New Testament acknowledges this speaking God and adds to it its own revelation of the eternal Word itself. "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son." (Heb. 1:1, 2)

The God of the Bible rules and reigns. He is never frustrated in achieving His purposes, whether in the individual lives of men or in the massive combination of empire might. "Thine is the Kingdom," we say in closing the prayer that Jesus taught us in the New Testament. His also is the kingdom in the Old Testament, Assyria, Babylonia, Egypt, Persia notwithstanding. (Cf. Dan. 1:7, 27; 2:44)

Not only do we find the same God in both Testaments, the description of man and his relationship to God is also the same.

Both the Old and the New Testament describe man as at odds with God. The perfect fellowship that once existed has been broken by man's rebellion against God. Left to himself, man would remain in the curse of this godlessness, shut out from life, in trespasses and sin. And yet man was not left to die like the animal of the field. What God put into man in creation, His own image, has not been lost totally. In the marred image there remains — as it were — still a point of contact from which God proceeded to recreate a fellowship with man.

Just a few illustrations. This rupture with God is the sad condition of all men. Both Testaments recognize unmistakably the universality of sin. "There is no man that sinneth not," we read in 1 Kings 8:46. "Who can say I have made my heart clean,

I am pure from my sins?" (Prov. 20:9). The New Testament passages are known to us from our Catechism instruction: "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God." (Rom. 3:23; Rom. 5:19; etc.)

Furthermore, every sin is a sin against God. There are no purely social sins. True, we may hurt and harm our fellow man — and this is forbidden — yet more profoundly and in the final analysis every injury of the neighbor is a sin against God. David, rebuked by Nathan for his mistreatment of Uriah and Bathsheba, says: "I have sinned against the Lord" (2 Sam. 12:13). "Against Thee, Thee only, have I sinned and done this evil in Thy sight" (Ps. 51:4). Paul, in the New Testament, says the same thing: "But when ye sin so against the brethren and wound their weak conscience, ye sin against Christ" (1 Cor. 8:12). Surely there can be no higher social ethic.

Again, sin is man's destruction. It is self-destructive. The Old Testament stresses particularly that evil does not come about in man's life mechanically or in an inevitable chain of unavoidable circumstances. It is God's retribution upon sin. "The God of Israel stirred up the spirit of Pul, king of Assyria, and the spirit of Tiglath-Pileser, king of Assyria, and he carried them away" (1 Chron. 5:26). "The Lord sent against him [the king of Jerusalem] bands of the Chaldees. . . . Surely at the commandment of the Lord came this upon Judah" (2 Kings 24:2 f.). "Shishak, king of Egypt, came up against Jerusalem because they had transgressed against the Lord" (2 Chron. 12:2). In this context the prophet Amos can make the sweeping statement: "Shall there be evil in a city, and the Lord hath not done

it?"
have
ing d
"bec
thy v
Th
disas
with
"Seel
5:6)
sinne
not r
ing
volve
envis
the
mere
Test
but r
6:23
M
curse
life
With
know
Test
more
of th
of i
scrip
vatio
Israe
Bab
O h
sake
at al
Lore
from
The
peop
trac
grac

it?" (3:6). In the New Testament we have our Lord's own words about the coming destruction of Jerusalem and its cause: "because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation." (Luke 19:42 f.)

The curse of sin is more than a physical disaster. Its consequence is death written with a capital "D." When Amos pleads, "Seek the Lord, and ye shall live" (Amos 5:6), or when Ezekiel says, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die" (Ezek. 18:4), it does not mean that merely a cessation of breathing and a stopping of the heartbeat is involved. Nowhere does the Old Testament envisage dying as a mere disintegration of the body, as little as the curse of sin is merely temporal death when the New Testament says, "The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life." (Rom. 6:23)

Man's inability to free himself from the curse that separates him from God and life is fully recognized in the whole Bible. Without documenting this fact with well-known Bible verses from the Old and New Testaments let me merely point out once more that man is not saved by the keeping of the Law in the Old Testament in spite of its multitude of requirements and prescriptions. The initiative for man's salvation always is with God. He chose Israel, He brought Israel back from the Babylonian Captivity not "for your sakes, O house of Israel, but for Mine holy name's sake" (Ezek. 36:22). "Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? saith the Lord God; and not that he should return from his ways and live?" (Ezek. 18:23). The covenant that God made with His people in the Old Testament is not a contract between equals. It is a covenant of grace. It is God's promise to forgive and

thus to receive man back into fellowship with Him. The keeping of the Law does not create a reunion with God but it is the expression of this reunion and man's response to the mercy of God.

Not only Paul had to set men's thinking straight on this point. The prophets of old already fulminated against a way of salvation that man thought to achieve by observance of the Law. So absolute was their denunciation of the perversion of what God intended by these laws and so sweeping was their insistence on a penitent heart, pleading God's mercy, that for a time some Old Testament scholars were led to believe that the prophets repudiated sacrifice and cult worship entirely. Contradictory as it may appear, these laws were God's way — and we shall not ask why God chose it — of keeping men aware of their unholiness and their constant need of grace and mercy until He came who by His perfect obedience to God's will and the shedding of His blood redeemed men from the curse of the Law. In the Old Testament God imposed the yoke of the Law. But God's purpose was not that man should earn salvation by the keeping of that Law, something no man could do.

God claims a response from man in the New Testament that is no less all-inclusive. Jesus sums up its requirements by quoting the Old Testament: "Thou shalt love the Lord, thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind . . . thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." (Matt. 22:37-39)

In this sketch — and it is a very brief one — of the doctrines of God and of man the unity of the Bible is evident. But we still have not gone to the center of this unity, although we could not avoid touch-

ing on it. The unity of the ideas of the Bible is striking. But the religion of the Bible is not primarily one of ideas, abstractions, and systems of speculative thought held together by consistent categories of logic. The religion of the Bible is the story of God in action to save men. To tell of the Christian religion we need, above all, action words. God made, He planned, He chose, He promised, He fulfilled, He loved, He gave, He sent, He redeemed, He raised from the dead. It is *Heilsgeschichte*, a history of salvation. Lest this term be understood falsely, as it is often used falsely, let me add that one of His acts is that He also spoke — He spoke to interpret these great acts to man. And He did so infallibly, and by the working of the same miraculous power, that we might fully understand the significance and the meaning of His great deeds of salvation. God has indeed achieved His purposes of grace. God has completed the wondrous deeds of His eternal counsel. But deeds have no meaning in themselves. So He acted again. He moved holy men to speak and to write the infallible and absolute truth about Himself and His deeds so that men by the power of that same Word might be enabled to become wise unto salvation, which He has made possible.

D. *The Unity in Jesus Christ*

These acts of salvation and this message of salvation culminate in Jesus Christ. He is the Center of Scripture. To Him and from Him flow and return all the lines of this one book.

But the Savior was not born of Eve. The son of Eve was not the woman's Seed. Centuries elapsed, millennia, before Christmas Eve came. The Old Testament was

composed and finished long before that holy night. The New Testament was not written till after Good Friday, Easter, Ascension Day. But this "before" and this "after" is the wondrous unity of a "now" in the two Testaments. It is the unity of promise and fulfillment, but in such a marvelous co-operation of its parts that not only is there no grinding of gears, but it develops its full power precisely when the Old and the New Testament are meshed together.

1. *The Unity of Promise and Fulfillment.* — Let us examine this unity of promise and fulfillment. If Jesus Christ is not the Center of the Bible, then it falls apart into a formless heap of meaningless and irreconcilable pieces. Then the hope of the Old Testament was an illusion. Then the New Testament in looking back to that hope as fulfilled is a hoax. But Jesus Christ is the great, powerful Magnet that attracts and holds together the many particles of Scripture, and its particles all are of such a nature that they respond to this magnetic field and cluster about Him.

And because Christ is the Center of Scripture, only he who in faith accepts Him can see the full and decisive unity of Scripture and experience its unifying power. Paul said that the Jews did not understand Scripture because there was a veil over their eyes. It is always so. To someone who is born blind you can talk days on end about color, the green of the grass, the blue of the sky, and the scintillating hues of the rainbow, and he will fail to understand entirely what you mean. When the Holy Spirit removes the scales of unbelief from the spiritually blind eyes of man, then he sees — more certainly than anything that is perceived by physical sight

— that the unity of Scripture is the foolishness of the Cross. When John 3:16 no longer is a contradiction of man's proud wisdom and self-sufficiency, but has become his glorious hymn of praise and is spiritually discerned, then all of Scripture, which like John the Baptist bears witness to the Lamb of God that takes away the sin of the world, becomes an harmonious whole of God's promise and fulfillment of His salvation that transcends man's understanding and transforms his life.

Only the whole man — the man made whole in Christ Jesus by the Spirit of God — can understand the whole of Scripture as it wants to be understood. This is not to say that in the promise and fulfillment of Scripture no clear and consistent pattern of unity is recognizable. The Old Testament is not a dissertation in abstract terms and ideas about universal man. It is the history of one people, chosen by God for His own special purposes. When Israel as a nation failed to serve as God's instrument, He destroyed it that in a "remnant" His design and plan might be carried forward. And to the New Testament writers the whole story of the people of Israel, their divine call, their redemption from Egypt, the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai, their establishment in the Holy Land, the building of the temple, the tragedy of the exile, and the subsequent resurrection and return of the remnant to Zion, are all foreshadowings of the greater and final salvation in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus. Apart from this, they have in themselves no abiding significance and are not fully comprehensible (cf. Tasker, p. 16). St. Augustine said it long ago: "The New Testament lies hidden in the Old, and the Old becomes manifest in

the New." And this relation and correspondence is not imposed upon Scripture, it is there in the very woof and web of its texture. It has one story to tell from Adam to the apostolic age.

"So as a Christian Paul did not lay aside as useless all the great knowledge of the Old Testament which he had received at the feet of Gamaliel. Rather did he baptize into Christ all this knowledge, seeing the whole history of Israel as incomplete apart from the redemptive work of Christ, but as lit up with fresh meaning when interpreted in the light of the final revelation in which it finds its fulfillment" (Tasker, p. 94). Paul's sermon at Antioch in Pisidia (Acts 13) is an interesting example of the way in which he connected the Old Testament with the New Testament. For him it was not merely a record of prophetic utterances but the account "of a series of acts of God, acts of saving grace which reach their climax and find their fulfillment in the redemption brought about by the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus Christ" (Tasker, p. 85). Paul's sermon is a part of our New Testament and is evidence of the unity that is in Scripture for all to read and to behold.

Rowley calls attention to an example of how the fulfillment bears in itself the evidence of the design of God. The death of Jesus was to achieve what the sacrifices of the Old Testament foreshadowed. Perhaps the clearest promise of it is found in Isaiah 53. Uncounted Christians have stood under the cross of Calvary and found no better way to express what happened there than to repeat the Old Testament Scripture: "Surely He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows. . . . He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for

our iniquities." This is not a fanciful and forced reading of the New Testament back into the Old Testament. The dying Servant of the Lord in Isaiah is the Passover Lamb led to the slaughter. Was it accidental that the sacrifice of the Lamb of God took place at the time of the Old Testament Passover festival? "If someone had sat down to create a story that should be dramatically appropriate, one could understand his lighting on the time of the Passover for the climax of his story." But the fact of the matter is that it was the enemies of Christ who chose this time to strike, not in order to fulfill Scripture but to gain their own objectives.

If the hand of God was at work, carrying the old revelation forward into a new one, lifting the old deliverance to a new plane of deliverance, filling the ancient festival a second time with fresh significance, one could understand it. But if it were merely the accident of the choice of Christ's foes that caused this remarkable coincidence, it would be both surprising and beyond all explanation. For to declare a thing an accidental coincidence and to leave it at that is to offer no explanation, but to declare that it is incapable of explanation. [Rowley, *The Unity of the Bible*, p. 113]

Just as remarkable is our Lord's prior declaration that His foes would strike at that time and the manner in which He linked His death with the old covenant sacrifice by speaking of His blood as the blood of the new covenant (Cf. Jer. 31:31 ff.). "So many Old Testament streams run together here that only a blinding prejudice can hide their significance." (Rowley, p. 113)

2. *The Unity in Newness*

But the unity of promise and fulfillment is not merely the sequence of one happen-

ing following another. It is not merely the continuity of new events following old ones. It is not merely the arrival of something bigger or an improved model. In the fulfillment there is indeed, as we have already seen, a full and resounding "yea and amen" to the old. But there is also an unmistakable "nay." The fulfillment of the New Testament expressly supersedes enactments of God in the Old Testament as they are set forth on so many of its pages. But it is in this very abrogation and supersession by the new that the tie with the old is so clearly to be found. This may seem contradictory and absurd, but it is in this paradox of "yes and no" that the divine unity of the Bible manifests itself.

The old covenant is not a previous covenant of God of a different nature, on a different basis, and for a different purpose that God has repudiated. But in the new covenant the old has reached its fullest expression and validity. What once was promise has now become full — a full reality. But thereby everything that had meaning only as a part of the promise, everything provisional, has served its purpose, and it, too, is fulfilled. Old in that sense and abrogated for that reason are what we call the ceremonial and political laws of the old covenant. All that lay dormant and hidden in them has now risen into reality.

Perhaps we have come to take for granted this yea and nay of the New Testament to the Old Testament and have lost some of the wonder of its paradox. It is when we look at Judaism that the radical claim of the New Testament to be the fulfillment of the old becomes evident.

Post-Biblical Judaism also is rooted in the Old Testament and is unintelligible

with
Test
to n
is th
Old
to s
Test
Old
out
nor
deve
not
Test
foll
hop

I
C
V
in t
Tes
bef
His
also
God
enal
to h
life.

V
to a
with
of
inta
una
hol
a G
own
of

F
the
see
live
The

without the Old Testament. But the Old Testament does not need modern Judaism to make the Old Testament intelligible, as is the case in the New Testament. The Old Testament continually looks forward to something beyond itself; and the New Testament continually looks back to the Old Testament. Neither is complete without something beyond itself. There is nothing of this kind in Judaism. It is a development out of the Old Testament but not that something to which the Old Testament looks forward and which should follow it; it is not the response to its hopes. (Cf. Rowley, p. 95)

IV. THE UNITY OF THE SCRIPTURE COMPREHENDS LAW AND GOSPEL

We have seen that the God of the Bible in the Old Testament as well as in the New Testament is the holy and righteous God before whom sinful man must flee because His wrath is a consuming fire. We have also seen that the God of the Bible is the God of love and mercy who invites and enables the creatures deserving His wrath to be united with Him and to share His life.

We want to stress here that according to all of Scripture this unity exists in God without a compromise of His holiness or of His love. His righteous holiness is intact when He is Love, and His love is unadulterated and pure when His righteous holiness asserts itself. Surely this is not a God whom men have fashioned in their own image and according to the pattern of their own thinking.

Heathen religions are unable to unite these irreconcilables into one God, as they see evil and good come to them in their lives. They need more than one God. They divide. They have a good god whom

they love and a bad god whom they fear and try to placate or make harmless by magic. The same inability of man to have such a unified God finds expression in much of modern thought. There are those who claim adherence to the God of the Bible but can fit into their thinking a God who is only love. To assume that the God of love would permit men's lives to be snuffed out in disaster and even cast out men into outer darkness where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth is an insult to God, they say; yea, it is a complete negation and denial of God. Such a division of the God of Scripture is ultimately a relapse into heathenism. It demonstrates man's tendency to make God in the image of his disharmonious confusion; it reflects the disunity that is within man: a spiritual schizophrenia. But the Scripture proclaims it unequivocally already in the old confession of Israel: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord, our God, is one God."

But this unit God and yet "double" God does not remain bound up in the mystery of His being. In the Bible He expresses and reveals Himself and His relationship to us in the same unfathomable "double-ness" of His holy judgment and loving acts of redemption and salvation. We refer to these two central teachings of Scripture as Law and Gospel. Here again is a unity of Scripture that is incomprehensible in its diversity.

Law and Gospel are and remain opposites. They are not mingled. The one does not tone down or neutralize the other. The teachings of Scripture do not become something sweet-sour as when we combine sugar and vinegar for a salad dressing. This black and white of Scripture does not merge into a compromising gray. For only

when the Law and the Gospel are applied in their absolute and exclusive difference does the teaching of Scripture accomplish its purpose. The Law always accuses, say our Confessions. It condemns every sin and pronounces the death sentence on every sinner — its curse is never softened by the Gospel. Conversely, the Gospel is the absolute and categorical message of life — its promises, if accepted, are not affected by the Law; the Law does not apply to the Gospel; there is no Law and no curse and no demand of the Law in the Gospel.

So absolutely different are the Law and the Gospel. But while they are distinct they dare not be separated if God is to achieve His purpose. Together they are the unified teaching of Scriptures for a unified purpose. The Bible does not permit us to preach the Law without adding the Gospel when the Law has accomplished its purpose. It does not permit us to preach a Gospel which does not bring help from the curse of the Law, for without the Law the Gospel is meaningless.

This absolute diversity and yet "togetherness" of Law and Gospel of the Bible, this distinction and yet interaction, meets the need of man. It supplies, above all, the solution of the tension that the Christian still sees and experiences in his own life. Because the Christian is what he is, he finds in this "double" and yet single Scripture that which answers to the mysterious double-mindedness which he senses, although he is at one with God through faith in Christ. In fact, the more he progresses in a Christ-centered life, the more does he realize how much he needs the Law undiluted in its severity and at the same time how precious and absolutely necessary the Gospel is in its unconditional

promise. Keeping them separate, yet experiencing the need of both, this is the mystery of the distinctive and yet unified Word of God as the believer knows it. And he knows it better and more fully as he lives his life of faith and exercises himself in holy living.

This was the great discovery that Luther made when he read and studied the Scriptures. In them he found the only true and satisfying description of himself and his needs. He expressed it in the well-known phrase that is at the heart of his theology: the Christian is at the same time just and a sinner (*simul iustus et peccator*). This paradoxical statement was not a theoretical proposition for Luther to be debated in detached isolation from life. It represented the victory over the agony of his soul; it came to him from Scripture by the Spirit's help to end the turmoil that drove him to the edge of despair when he tried to find the answer to the question: How do I get a gracious God? Just, absolutely just and free from all condemnation by virtue and power of the Gospel; a sinner subject to the Law — contradictory as this may be, it solved the contradiction that he found in his inmost being. It was the only answer to his needs.

Therefore Luther was most insistent that this paradox of Scripture be left intact. Any compromising of the absoluteness of this fact, any watering down or dilution, he rejected as ruinous. He made the ability to distinguish between Law and Gospel the prime requisite of a theologian. He said: "Whoever is able well to distinguish the Law from the Gospel, let him give praise to God, and let him know that he is a theologian" (WA 40, 1, 207). But this distinction is not merely a theoretical profi-

ciency or a skill required of the professional theologian; it is an art that every Christian can and must acquire. "Whenever the Law and sin terrify and crush conscience, then you should say: There is a time for dying and a time for living, there is a time for hearing and a time for casting aside the Law, there is a time for hearing the Gospel, there is a time for not knowing the Gospel" (WA 40, 1, 209).

But by this distinction he did not minimize the fact that the center of Scripture is Christ, the Savior. Luther would get very vehement when Law and Gospel were mixed so that Christ was given the role of another Lawgiver, another Moses. He could even say: "If Christ comes and speaks to you like Moses when you are penitent of your sins and says: What have you done? then strike Him dead. But if He speaks to you like God and like your Savior, then listen with both ears" (WA, TR, II, 2655a). So distinct is the Gospel from the Law. They exclude each other as absolutely as wrath and love, judgment and grace, heaven and hell.

Yes, it is true in a sense that all of Scripture in the effect which it produces can be Law — it is that for the unbeliever since it comes to him as a demand to keep the Law and to repent of his wickedness. Likewise all of Scripture in the effect that it produces is Gospel — it is that for the believer who knows that his infractions of the Law are canceled and that the demands of the Law have been fulfilled for him.

Yet both are necessary and cannot be separated. Luther says: "Although these two are the most distinct (*distinctissima*), they are nevertheless the most conjoined (*coniunctissima*) in the same heart. Nothing is more conjoined than fear and

trust, Law and Gospel, sin and grace; for they are so conjoined that the one is absorbed (*absorbeatur*) by the other" (WA 40, 1, 527). Both Law and Gospel in their absolute antitheses meet the needs of the believer. It is only by the working of the Holy Spirit that the Christian is able to distinguish them. But by the operation of the same Holy Spirit he recognizes himself for what he is: just and a sinner. He knows, as Luther says in the first of his 95 Theses, that the Christian's whole life is one continuous living of repentance. That means that he also acknowledges the Law and its condemnation of his sin. In fact, the more he embraces the Gospel, the more does he find himself falling short of the demands of the Law, so that he cries out with Paul: O wretched man that I am — I am chief of sinners.

But the daily repentance of the Christian is also a turning away from the Law to the Gospel, for he knows that he is just by faith through grace. He knows that in the Gospel the Law is fulfilled and that the threat and the coercion of the Law as Law no longer exist. The claims of the Law have been nullified through the life, death, and resurrection of Christ; they are nullified by faith in Christ; they will remain nullified forever even after death.

The daily repentance of the Christian also brings about the resolve to do the will of God. Here above all he recognizes himself as just and sinner. The same words of Scripture that demanded obedience and certain death for their transgression and that said, "Thou shalt," no longer comes to him as a "Thou shalt" in their coercion and threat. He needs no Law in its coercive and threatening power. He does the

will of God as spontaneously and as freely as light will shine because it is light.

But at the same time, he knows that he does not succeed in being wholly just; he remains a sinner. And to that extent he needs the Law. The old Adam, crucified though he is, has not been annihilated but revives again and again and must be held in check lest he erupt in the blackest of sins. The Christian still is beset by the same temptations that brought mighty David and self-secure Peter to fall. The old Adam is as self-righteous as ever and must daily be shattered in his unholy claims of self-righteousness by the annihilating and crushing demand for perfection of the Law. A hidden Pharisee lurks still within every Christian. The old Adam is also a cunning mystic, he devises his own standards of what is God-pleasing in his service to God. By the letter of the Law he must be instructed in what is well-pleasing to God.

Much more could and should be said about these two great doctrines of Scripture. The point that interests us at this time is that both are in Scripture, each in its absolute difference, the Law is Law and never Gospel: the Gospel is Gospel and never Law. And yet in their absolutely different purpose and effect, they meet the demand of the whole man. Where else could such a unity in diversity originate than in God? This conviction will grow in the measure that we immerse ourselves in Scripture. We are overwhelmed alike by the inexhaustible grace of the Gospel and by the implacability of the Law. We shall be the more convinced that we cannot adequately and fully distinguish them as we ought, and this means that we never fully can understand the miracle that is the

one Bible. We don't only know of the unity of the Bible, we live the miraculous unity of Scripture every day of our lives, as Law and Gospel guide, direct, and sustain us.

V. *The Unity of Scripture Is of God*

Unified in our inmost being through the Word of Scripture by the working of the Holy Spirit in its proclamation, we say triumphantly: This is the Word of God. Words that so fit my most desperate needs and meet them so perfectly, words that so combine opposites and yet remain opposites, are not the invention or the product of man. They can come only from a God who Himself is holy and who is Love.

And so we end as we began: the unity of Scripture is an article of faith. For it is only by faith that we accept for our salvation the words spoken and written by men as God moved them to speak and to write. This is the miracle of the unity of Scripture that it is the unified product of an otherwise impossible combination of opposites: fallible, sinful, dead, death-cursed creatures, and the holy and infallible God. Scriptures themselves call this unified and unifying process inspiration. To accept this Word is not a heavy and burdensome demand before which the Christian cringes. This Word calls forth rejoicing and thanksgiving. Before this miracle of God's condescension faith sings its paeon of praise and says: All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, because it can add: It is profitable for correction, for reproof, "for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." Thanks be to God for His unspeakable love!

St. Louis, Mo.

WI

W

minu
extre
is an
can
yond
missi
incal
that
and
giver
ante
the s
God's
sion,
what

W
foun
"one
sense
of G
sent
Test
they
and
were
the
sent
siani
cial
God,
Jesu
apos
ques

1
Missi
wörte
Über
Rupr

What Is a "Missionary," Anyway?

By GRAEME M. ROSENAU

WHAT is a "missionary," anyway? The answer cannot be given in 30 minutes or 30 hours. Some things that are extremely important can be said, and this is an attempt to say them. But what is said can by its very generality point only beyond itself to the greatness of the work we missionaries have laid upon us and to the incalculable magnitude of the divine grace that has called us, even us, in our weakness and incapability, to perform it and has given us the power and promise that guarantee success. Only let us remember that the success will come in God's way and on God's terms. In humble trust and submission, then, let us ask, "As a missionary, just what am I, anyway?"

We know that *missionary* is a term not found in Scripture. But the word means "one who is sent," and in the Christian sense has its roots deep in the very nature of God's plan of salvation. God has always sent men on missions for Him. In the Old Testament He sent His prophets. But since they preached primarily to the Israelites and only occasionally to the heathen, they were not missionaries in the usual sense of the term.¹ In the New Testament God sent John the Baptist to prepare the Messianic highway. He sent His Son in a special sense, for this Jesus not only spoke of God, but in Him God appeared. And Jesus, the sent God of God, sent His apostles in turn on a mission of world conquest. Here is really the beginning of

Christian world missions. So as missionaries each of us can properly say, "I am a man who stands in the apostolic succession, a man *on* Christ's world mission and in one of His local missions."

I

First, then, *as a missionary I am a man who stands in an apostolic succession.* It would lead to small appreciation of my status as missionary if I were to pass lightly over those first words: "I am a man." Thus I am descended from him who was created in the image of God and have, but for the fall, a tremendous potential for the creative. But as Adam fell, I, who am born in his image, now have a natural rebellious tendency to destroy. I naturally use the dominion that is part of the divine image not as an agent of God but as His enemy.

But, thank the Lord, I am a man *in an apostolic succession.* I am called by the same Christ who said to the apostles, "Follow Me"—called to be conformed to His image; I am taught through Spirit and Word by the very Christ who instructed the apostles; and I am sent by the Christ who commissioned the apostles. Therefore, as Franzmann well phrased it in speaking of the church, I stand in an apostolic succession "in a sense and in a reality which no unbrokenly successive imposition of palms on pates can guarantee."²

I am called by the Christ who said to His first missionaries, "You have not chosen Me, but I have chosen you" (John

¹ Heinz Brunotte, "Mission, Missionspredigt, Missionsreisen," *Biblisch-Theologisches Handwörterbuch zur Lutherbibel und zu neueren Übersetzungen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1954), p. 379.

² Martin H. Franzmann, "The Apostolate: Its Enduring Significance in the Apostolic Word," *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, XXVIII (March 1957), 197.

15:16). Here is grace indeed! Out of the world and its darkness Christ has chosen *me*. In the Gospel, spoken, written, and signed, I hear Him say, "Be of good cheer; *your* sins are forgiven!" Without that gracious call and faith therein, I can never rightly call myself a missionary.

If I am called by Christ, I am also a man under the training of Christ through His Spirit and Word. In this sense I am an ever-growing theologian. I will be well versed in systematic theology, especially the Lutheran Confessions. I will be acquainted with the history of the Christian church. I will be a good practical theologian, knowing and practicing the principles of effective communication, for I must be "apt to teach" (1 Tim. 3:2). But first and foremost I will be an exegete! For God speaks to me first and foremost in the naked Word of Scripture and only by derivation in systematic, historical, and practical volumes. "If you continue in My Word, then are you My disciples indeed, and you shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:31,32). It cannot be denied that this word of Jesus in a very real sense urges us to a life-shaping pursuit of Spirit-imploing Biblical exegesis!

As a man in an apostolic succession I am, finally, one who has received from Christ a *commission* and the *power* to carry it out. For Jesus has said to His Twelve, and through them to His church, and to me,

All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to Me. Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, by baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and by teaching them to observe all that I have commanded

you. And lo, I am with you always, until the end of time. (Matt. 28:18-20)

Now it is true that I do not hold the office of apostle in the sense that the Eleven received it; that is why I am called not "apostle" but "missionary." But the world mission, the means of performing it, the power to make it effective, and the nearness of Christ are still present actualities for me. As a man after Adam's image, I find it naturally easiest to use my powers for destruction. But in Christ God has called and qualified me for the creative—to be His agent in the work of creating new life in dead men, no less! But this work by its very nature brings greater damnation to those who refuse my missionary call to "repent and believe the Gospel" (cf. John 12:44-50 et al.). It is a work for which, in its glory and its terror, I *alone* would be inadequate. It is an occupation which, in its searingly brilliant heights and blackest depths, would never have entered my unconverted mind. It lies before me as a daily appeal to faith and a constant call to do battle with the ways and opinions of my flesh. It is truly *God's* work, for God has laid His hand upon me, and I am now His missionary, standing in the succession of His apostles. However I may look to the world and to my own fleshly mind, I am a man *on* Christ's world mission and *in* one of His local missions. It is this dual mission of which I now must speak a little while.

II

First, then, as a missionary I am a man on Christ's world mission. In this phase of my work I am to represent Christ to the world. I go out as one who has met Christ in His Word and as one empowered to witness to what I have seen there. Having received the Spirit of power, I am to cry to

all with eschatological urgency, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of your sins." As a missionary I am not just a Bible passer or tract pusher. This would make it too easy for the person with whom I'm dealing to muse about the matter idly or to fail to ponder it at all. No, I am a man with a living voice to speak the life-giving Gospel. I am to be what Franzmann (p. 194) calls "a living, urgent, and waiting person who will not let us off without a decision."

As Christ's commissioned representative to the world, I am to work hard at dealing with *individuals*. The late Rev. A. H. Haake, former chairman of Synod's Board for Home Missions, often reiterated this point: "You don't build the church from the pulpit." By oversimplifying, the statement makes a valid emphasis. Like the Christ I represent, I dare not rely only on public address for dealing with people. Remembering Jesus' encounters with men like Nicodemus, Simon the Pharisee, and Zacchaeus, I will receive and *seek out* the *individual* to show him the Way of life.

I am a man on a *world* mission for Christ, reaching out to the world *person by person* as the Lord opens their doors. As a man on a *world* mission, I am to reach out to *all* in my neighborhood. In this age of wide travel and student exchange, and in mosaic America, the world may truly lie right at my door. I will therefore extend Christ's call to *all*. The folk idea that the Jews have cursed themselves and can therefore be by-passed must be rooted and burned out of my mind with the pick and fire of Christ's love. I am a missionary of the *Gospel*; I am not the executor of God's wrath! I must call also the Jews in my ter-

ritory. They are part of the world I am sent to conquer, and Christ will welcome them. Schlatter's observation is most thought-provoking; he says of the apostles,

They are to bring the good news to all nations by beginning at Jerusalem. To Jerusalem the Gospel comes first. In the fact that Jesus can give His disciples this commission, the petition "Father, forgive them," which Jesus uttered on the cross, is fulfilled.³

As a faithful missionary to the world I will also include those of other colors and those from other countries. I realize that Synod has passed a resolution or several to this effect, but I do not act primarily on that account. I feel the pressure of public opinion both from within and from without the church; but I don't act—or refrain from acting—because of that. For in the mercy of God I learn, as I follow Christ, "to renounce the majority and to go the way of God alone" (p. 187). And the way of God is the way to *all* the world. I act because *Christ* tells me to; His word "Make disciples of *all nations*" is clear.

As a man on Christ's world mission I am to work as a free man in Christ, self-enslaved to all for the sake of the Gospel. St. Paul points the way.

For although I am free from all, I enslaved myself to all in order that I might gain as many as possible. And I became for the Jews like a Jew, in order to gain Jews—to those under the Law as if I were under the Law, although I myself am not actually under the Law, in order that I might gain those who are under the Law. For the lawless I became as if I were lawless, although I am not lawless before God but

³ Comment on Luke 24:47, 48 in his *Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament*. Quoted in Franzmann, p. 184.

am in the Law of Christ, in order that I might gain the lawless. I became weak for the weak in order that I might gain the weak. I have become all things for all people in order that I might save at least some. But I do all things on account of the Gospel, in order that I might become its partner. 1 Cor. 9:19-23.

Applying Paul's concise summary of his approach to the unconverted to my own situation, I note that I am free in Christ. I owe my allegiance to no mere man or any human system, for as a slave of Christ I am free from their dominion. I am free from the Jews and their legal codes, from the Gentiles and their lawless service to the flesh, from the weak and their scruples, and indeed from *all* men and the bonds that hold them fast. I have received this freedom in Christ through the Gospel call and Baptism; I keep it by continuing in His Word. And I know it will last when all human categories and claims have passed away.

But I am not free in a vacuum; I am free "in the law of Christ"; this law of love keeps me from using my freedom rashly and selfishly. It makes the other person rather than myself the center of existence and activity. As a missionary I have a goal: to gain as many people as possible for Christ. Above all else I want to save at least some. My life's ambition is to live in such a way as to gain a hearing for the Gospel and thus to become its partner in the work of saving people. Free from all people, I can in love willingly submit to all in order to gain them; for if I do not adapt to their respective ways I am making myself an outsider and blocking communication of the Gospel. The *one* thing I must avoid is compromising, by my conduct, the very Gospel I desire to share with them!

III

As a Christian missionary I am a man who stands in an apostolic succession, a man on Christ's world mission. But under the practice deemed wise by my fellow Christians in District and Synod, I do not cover as wide an area as did, for instance, the apostle Paul. *As a missionary in this United States I am a man in one of Christ's local missions. In this, the pastoral, phase of my work I represent Christ to His people, the people to Christ, and Christ's people to one another.*

I represent Christ to His people. This is in fulfillment of Christ's commission to make disciples "*by teaching them.*" I am to speak for Christ to His people, giving them His Word as He has given it to me through His Spirit in Scripture. Yet I must not only speak but also listen! I must listen until I approach Christ's own understanding of the people He has placed into my assistant shepherd's care. When I have listened enough to understand, then I can speak the Word of power most helpfully. Bonhoeffer's summary is apt:

Christians have forgotten that the ministry of listening has been committed to them by Him who is Himself the great Listener and whose work they should share. We should listen with the ears of God that we may speak the Word of God.⁴

I also represent the people to Christ. I am to be an intercessor before Christ in behalf of His people. Notice the apostles' reason for requesting help with the physical details of early church work: "But we will devote ourselves to prayer and to the ministry of the Word" (Acts 6:4). That is why we, too, have lay helpers and secre-

⁴ Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Life Together* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954), pp. 98, 99.

aries—in order that we might give ourselves more fully to prayer and the Word. And a big part of that prayer ministry will be taken up with intercession. Says Bonhoeffer:

A Christian fellowship lives and exists by the intercession of its members for one another, or it collapses. I can no longer condemn or hate a brother for whom I pray, no matter how much trouble he causes me. . . . Intercession is . . . a daily service we owe to God and our brother. . . . The ministry of intercession requires time of every Christian, but most of all of the Christian pastor who has the responsibility of a whole congregation. . . . Because intercession is such an incalculably great gift of God, we should accept it joyfully. . . . We should train ourselves to set apart a regular hour for it as we do for every other service we perform. . . . For the pastor it is an indispensable duty, and his whole ministry will depend on it. [Pp. 86 f.]

I represent Christ to His people, the people to Christ, and Christ's people to one another. This does not mean that I am to take over the responsibility of each Christian in my care so that he can stop edifying his brother. It means that in the name of and for the brothers I speak the Word to each in public and private, and that in the name of and for the brothers I encourage each to greater love of the brethren and zeal in Christ's work.

As a missionary I am a man *in* one of Christ's local missions. *In this, the organizational, phase of my work, I represent Synod to my group or congregation, and my group or congregation to Synod.* I am a mediator between those whose Christian concerns and zeal are centered in *one* locality and those who are concerned with the work of Christ in *many* areas. The

problems, opportunities, and thinking of the church at large come to me through my mission board. These I seek prayerfully to understand and to pass on meaningfully to the people in my care, that they may expand their Christian vision and concern beyond themselves. On the other hand, I know the people in my charge, their problems and needs and special opportunities, perhaps better than anyone else on earth. Therefore I seek prayerfully to lay these before the church at large through the mission board. Thus I am a key person in this delicate diplomatic work of developing the patience of universal vision in the local Christian community and the urgency of local need and opportunity in the church at large. This is no easy thing, and it, too, ought to take up a generous portion of time spent in prayer.

In summary, as a pastor and organizer for Christ of the people He has won through me and others from a given community, I am a man who himself knows God's love in Christ and who practices and propagates its like among His people. For it is *love* which summarizes God's attitude and action toward us, and it is *love* like His that Christ demands as the distinguishing mark of His disciples. As a missionary in a local mission I am to foster the development of a soundly Christian congregational tradition—not the snobbish tradition of the Ivy League nor the exclusive and esoteric tradition of the lodge but the soundly Christian tradition of living *love*. Under God's blessing I am to work with my people so that we recognize ourselves as being actively loved by God in Christ and then demonstrate that we ourselves are actively in Christlike love with one another and with *all*.

An important aspect of this is walking and working *with* those entrusted to my care. I am not their lord or enemy! I must recognize not only their sin but also — yes, *especially* — their God-given gifts. As Bonhoeffer points out,

A pastor should not complain about his congregation, certainly never to other people, but also not to God. A congregation has not been entrusted to him in order that he should become its accuser before God and men. [P.29]

Such slashing of the congregation or group, whether at pastoral conferences, in letters, or at prayer, is the kind of judging that seeks to justify and magnify self; it is opposed to justification by God's grace and the love and service it produces.

A sound congregational tradition means that I will fiercely fight the growth of a situation in which a few do all and the rest drift; where some are important and the rest are little noticed. Rather I will strive to employ each member significantly. I will realize this profound truth: "In a Christian community everything depends upon whether each individual is an indispensable link in a chain. . . . The elimination of the weak is the death of the fellowship." (P.94)

IV

One last question arises: How long shall I stay where I am? No definite answer is possible, for I stand in a tension. As a man *on* Christ's world mission, I am to be mobile. "He charged them to take nothing for their journey except a staff — no bread, no bag, no money in their belts — but to wear sandals and not put on two tunics" (Mark 6:8,9). But as a man *in* one of Christ's local missions I am to be stable. About all I can say is that I must be neither so materialistically anchored in my present place

as to be immobile nor so malcontent and loveless as to be unstable. Rather, as a balanced man, I am to follow my Lord and Leader, staying gladly till I'm sure He bids me go, but then going with no compunctions of materialistic or fleshly kinds.

As at the beginning, so also at the end I must say that such an attempt as this — briefly to define what it means for a man to say, "I am a missionary" — is not a self-contained work. It can be only a signpost, pointing to a life under the grace of God — lived to spread the grace of God *thoroughly* in my sector of "all nations" and, by teaching and baptizing constantly, to make disciples for Christ of all in my area who will "repent and believe the Gospel." "As a missionary, just what am I, anyway?" Ultimately, only I as an individual can answer that. For my unique personality and my mission's unique locality will change the answer in its details. "As a missionary, just what am I, anyway?" The final answer in your specific cases and in mine cannot be written on paper. It must be written in individual lives lost by God's grace for Christ and the Gospel in the individual missions of the church. And the God-given validity of each definition will be known only when as individual missionaries we receive from our enthroned Lord and Judge, and only by His grace, the words that may well raise goose bumps even on *heavenly* bodies, words that must first strike us numb and dumb and then fill our lips with an eternal, "Blessing and honor and glory and power be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne and unto the Lamb forever and ever." Those words, of course, are, "Well done, good and faithful servant! Enter into the joy of your Lord!"

Lake Arrowhead, Calif.

TH
B
G
A
B
\$
A
Nag
cam
most
final
com
tain
vatio
Jung
the
four
a su
unde
chel
Gill
comp
158
Copl
Labi
phot
style
conf
Sinc
the c
notic
A
taile
and
delay
teres
tion
Copl
ment
TH
geth
tame

1
ryph
to 16

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THOMAS.

By A. Guillaumont, Henri-Charles Puech, Gilles Quispel, Walter Till and Yassah 'Abd al-Masih. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959. vii + 62 pages. Cloth. \$2.00.

About the year 1945 some farmers near Nag Hammadi on the east side of the Nile came across a huge collection of manuscripts, mostly Gnostic in origin. Thirteen of these finally made their way into the hands of competent scholars and were found to contain 48 books in varying degrees of preservation. One of these manuscripts is called the Jung Codex, in honor of Carl Gustav Jung, the famous Swiss psychologist. One of the four texts in this codex was published in a sumptuous edition in Zurich (1956), under the title *Evangelium veritatis*, ed. Michel Malinine, Henri-Charles Puech and Gilles Quispel. Portions of two other codices comprising five documents were published in 158 plates in *Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo*, I, ed. Pahor Labib (Cairo, 1956). Included in these photographs was a reproduction of the self-styled Gospel of Thomas (GT), not to be confused with the apocryphal infancy gospel.¹ Since experts in Coptic are extremely scarce, the contents of these plates went largely unnoticed in this country.

At first it was planned to publish a detailed commentary along with the Coptic text and translation of GT, but to avoid further delay and, we suspect, to exploit public interest, it was determined to publish the edition under review, consisting only of the Coptic text and a translation. The commentary will follow at a later date.

The contents of this volume are not altogether new to the scholars of the New Testament. Already in 1952 Professor Puech

observed that passages in GT were quite similar to sayings extant in papyri which had been discovered at Oxyrhynchus in 1897 and 1903 by Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt.² Despite the differences between the two sets of sayings, it is quite apparent from a comparison of the Coptic with the Greek of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri that the emendations proposed by scholars for the fragmentary Greek text shot rather wide of the mark.

The title of the newly published work, which is a literal rendering of the last two lines of the Coptic text, is misleading. This "Gospel" is not a gospel in the canonical sense but rather a collection of 114 sayings, allegedly written by Thomas the apostle and introduced almost invariably by the formula "And Jesus said." The ascription to Thomas is evidently a pseudepigraphical device designed to secure apostolic sanction for the Gnostic thoughts advanced in the work. The codex, according to the editors, is probably to be dated in the late fourth or early fifth century A.D. and is a translation of a work which seems to have first been published in Greek about 140 A.D. Johannes Leipoldt, however, thinks that the original text was written in the fourth century, but was based on materials written before the synoptists had assumed canonical status, that is, before 200 A.D.³

Although the text offers little of theological value beyond the material it shares with the New Testament, GT has some significance for the possible light it may shed on Gospel origins. The newly discovered text has, it is

² "The Jung Codex and the Other Documents from Nag Hammadi," in *The Jung Codex: A Newly Recovered Gnostic Papyrus*, trans. and ed. F. L. Cross (London and New York, 1955), pp. 21 f.

³ See "Ein Neues Evangelium? Das koptische Thomasevangelium übersetzt und besprochen," *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, LXXXIII, No. 7 (July 1958), col. 494.

¹ See Montague Rhodes James, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford, 1955), pp. 14 to 16; 49—70.

true, much in common with the synoptists, proportionately less with the Fourth Gospel, but if source-critical methodology is to have any validity, the absence of any consistent pattern of verbal or thought correspondence would seem to point to literary independence and to the use of a very early Gospel tradition differing from our canonical gospels.⁴ Thus logion 47 observes that the new wineskins *spoil* the wine and completely alters the patching procedure criticized in Mark 2:21 and parallels. In logion 63 the rich man plans to use his financial resources to increase his production capacity, whereas in Luke 12:16-21 the farmer is in the first hours of retirement. See also the interesting variations in the parable of the disappointed host, logion 64. In logion 107 Jesus says to the lost sheep: "I love thee more than [πρὸς] ninety-nine." Moreover, rarely (see logion 32 and 33) do two or more synoptic sayings appear in the same sequence as they are found in the canonical gospels. Thus logion 47 inverts the order followed by the synoptists by putting the saying on the wineskins first (see also logion 45). Gnostic interests alone do not account for all these variations.

Gilles Quispel, to whom the world is in debt for his pioneering efforts on this and other Gnostic texts, is convinced that GT reflects a Jewish-Christian rather than a Hellenistic milieu. He has sought to trace the line of dependence to the fragmentary and apocryphal Gospel to the Hebrews.⁵ While

this alleged literary dependence is questionable in view of the fact that the Gospel to the Hebrews was designed as a complete Gospel and GT consists merely of sayings, the Jewish-Christian provenance of the text underlying the Gnostic work is indicated in at least 30 logia which, according to Quispel (p. 282), preserve traces of their Aramaic origin. (The Gnostic sect itself displays little affection for the Jews [see logion 43]). In logion 9, the parable of the sower, e.g., it is stated that "some [seeds] fell on the road." Mark's rendering, followed by Matthew and Luke, states that the seed fell alongside the road. An Aramaic phrase *עַל אֹרְחָא*, suggests Quispel, is behind the variation.⁶ The Aramaic expression can mean either "on" or "beside the road." The Gnostic rendering then may very well take us back to a form of the saying which antedates that in the synoptists. The fact that the explanation of the parable is lacking in GT would tend to encourage such a conclusion.

The implications of such findings for synoptic source criticism should require no further elucidation. In the event that GT's independence of the synoptists should be conclusively demonstrated, form historians will be certainly forced to reappraise their reconstruction of Gospel origins, for we find "hellenized" synoptic sayings in a strongly independent and very early Jewish-Christian tradition. The likelihood that the Christian community is responsible for the creation of

276—290; see p. 278. For the extant remains of the Gospel to the Hebrews see James, pp. 1—8.

⁶ Pages 277 f. Charles Cutler Torrey's observation (*The Four Gospels: A New Translation*, 2d ed. [New York and London, 1947], p. 298) thus finds external support. The use of the word "throw" instead of "sow" in both GT and I Clement 24:5 not only suggests GT's independence of the synoptists, but in conjunction with other phenomena we have noted, also points to a strongly entrenched primitive tradition.

⁴ This is the conclusion reached by Claus-Hunno Hunzinger (SBLE meeting, December 1959); cf. Leipoldt, col. 494. Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman, in *The Secret Sayings of Jesus* (Garden City, N.Y., 1960), on the other hand, are inclined "to hold that Thomas made use of our gospels, selecting from them what he liked," but they grant the possibility that he made use also of traditions underlying the gospels, pp. 107 f.

⁵ "Some Remarks on the Gospel of Thomas," *New Testament Studies*, V, 4 (July 1959),

many of the sayings is greatly diminished in direct ratio to the narrowing of the time span required for the development of such "form."

Secondly, the role of Q as a common source for Matthew and Luke's non-Markan material is more complex and ambiguous than ever before. Conflation, editorial modification, and free concatenation of materials circulating in either oral or written collections of varying length must in future studies of the synoptic problem be given greater consideration.

Additions in GT to the tradition underlying the synoptic accounts are in many cases readily identifiable because of their Gnostic cast. Thus in logion 8, corresponding to Matt. 13:47-50, the reference to the "large (and) good fish" appears to be an allusion to the perfect Gnostic. Opposition to Jewish legalism is apparent in logion 14, which reads in part (bracketed portions are retained):

If you fast (νηστεύειν), you will beget sin for yourselves, and if you pray, you will be condemned (κατακρίνειν), and if you give alms (ἐλεημοσύνη), you will do evil (κακόν) to your spirits (πνεῦμα).

Logion 21 reads like Gnostic polemic against the flesh:

Mary said to Jesus: Whom are thy disciples (μαθηταί) like? He said: They are like little children who have installed themselves in a field which is not theirs. When (ὅταν) the owners of the field come, they will say: "Release to us our field." They take off their clothes before them to release it (the field) to them and to give back their field to them.

See also logia 80 and 87. The Gnostic union of opposites accounts for such logia as 22 and 114, which speak of the inner becoming as the outer, and vice versa, and female becoming male.

The questionable morality of the finder of buried treasure in Matt. 13:34 is altered as follows:

The Kingdom is like a man who had a treasure [hidden] in his field, without knowing it. And [after] he died, he left it to his [son. The] son did not know (about it), he accepted that field, he sold [it]. And he who bought it, he went, while he was plowing [he found] the treasure. He began (ἄρχεσθαι) to lend money to whomever he wished. (Logion 109)

Occasionally fresh light is shed on the meaning of a synoptic parallel. The Christological accent of Luke 12:56 is enunciated more crisply in the addition, "and him who is before your face you have not known," logion 91. In a similar vein logion 100 has Jesus' answer in the story of the tribute money as follows: "Give the things of Caesar to Caesar, give the things of God to God *and give Me what is Mine*" [italics ours]. The Gnostic orientation is, of course, evident.

The word ἀπελπίζω in Luke 6:35 has undergone various explanations in commentaries. The Gnostic text reads: "If you have money, do not lend at interest, but (ἀλλά) give [them] to him from whom you will not receive them (back)" (logion 95), supporting not only the translation of the Vulgate, *nihil inde sperantes*, but also confirming the reading μηδέν instead of the form μηδένα, read by W Ξ Π (prima manu), 489, and the Syriac versions.

The parallel to Luke 6:35 suggests the importance of correctly assessing the contributions which GT can make to our textual-critical studies of the New Testament. To cite but one other example, Papyrus 45 has raised the question of a transposition in Luke 12:53. The papyrus puts the phrase for "son against father" ahead of the words "father against son." Logion 16, also from Egypt, confirms the traditional reading.

In this review and appraisal of the significance of this publication we have emphasized its importance for New Testament studies. Of even greater significance will be its contribution to the history of Gnosticism.

FREDERICK W. DANKER

Outlines on the Synodical Conference Gospels, Second Series

THE FEAST OF PENTECOST

JOHN 6:60-71

You have problems too deep to solve, foes too strong for defeat by your own hands, dangers too formidable to face alone. Your help is in the name of the Lord and especially the Lord's Holy Spirit. On this festival of Pentecost bring petitions to the Spirit; He will supply the need.

Two Pentecost Petitions

I. *"From every error keep us free"*

A. Error, disbelief, and doubt frequently impinge on man's faith. (1) Text (vv. 60-62). "Hard saying" (σκληρός, hard to receive, hard to accept). Here particularly Jesus' coming down from heaven (v. 58). Therefore v. 62, where Jesus says in effect: "You will find it easier to believe I came down from heaven when you see Me returning thither." Cp. John 3:13. — Also included in "hard saying": Jesus' statements recorded in vv. 48-57, referring to His death as a sacrifice for sin. These sayings met with doubt and disbelief. (2) Today still: "blood theology" is doubted or disbelieved; it is a "hard saying." Doubts also come to Christians regarding other doctrines: conversion, predestination, etc. V. 61: "Doth this offend you?" cause you to stumble? to doubt? to err? Cp. Matt. 11:6. Because you are a believing Christian, Satan will attempt to wrest your faith from you. He sows the seeds of doubt and disbelief. This danger is too formidable for you to face alone.

B. The Holy Spirit offers the deterrent to stave off such threatening danger. (1) The deterrent is the Word (v. 63; cp. Gal. 6:10-17). On "spirit" and "flesh" cp. John

3:6; 1 Cor. 15:45; 1 Peter 3:8. On the quickening power of the Word cp. John 15:3; Rom. 10:17. The Word gives life because Jesus, who is "the Life" (John 14:6), makes Himself known and offers Himself to mankind through the Word. Cp. John 5:39; John 17:3; John 20:31. The Holy Spirit operates through the Word (Eph. 6:17), staving off thereby the threatening perils of doubt and disbelief. (2) Today still "the words . . . are life" (text). The Holy Spirit through the Word "shall teach you all things" (John 14:26; the standard Gospel for the Feast of Pentecost). Wield the "sword of the Spirit." Use the Word. Pray: "Give to Thy Word impressive power" (Hymn 235:2). Pray: "Let Thy knowledge spread and grow, working error's overthrow" (Hymn 226:2). Petition: "From every error keep us free," and the Holy Spirit answers by overthrowing error and doubt by rooting Christians in the Word of life. (Eph. 3:17-19; Col. 2:6, 7)

II. *"Let none but Christ our master be"*

A. Some abandon Christ as Master; defection (apostasy) takes place. (1) Text (v. 66). Customary Pentecost theme: many being won by the Spirit (Acts 2:1-13, standard Epistle for Pentecost; 2:41, 47). But here the very opposite: defection. Facts recorded: "many went back."—Fulfillment of prophecy (Ps. 44:18). Returned to their former ways. Allowed the world to gain the mastery over them again. Went back to the world, with its short-lived pleasures (2 Tim. 4:10). Went back to purposeless, aimless living, opposite of 2 Cor. 5:15; Gal. 2:20. Went back to anxiety, perplexity, fear (John 15:5b; John 6:20). Went back to die in their sins (John 8:21, 24). Went to face eternity without

Chr
2:1
fect
tem
6:1
whi
from
27,
"wa
We
apo
E
for
Pete
lost
to J
Con
Jesa
"Th
beli
Chr
loya
16,
pres
and
(2)
tion
Pete
nev
Jesu
that
cho
loya
gua
2, 2
give
ciou
v. 6
in
tion
stri
Go
sult
2:1
ing

Christ as Advocate and Redeemer (1 John 2:1). (2) Today still: a great deal of defection from Christ. Many want Him for temporal advantage only. Cp. context (John 6:15, 26). Desire "free meals," the "meat which perisheth," rather than true bread from heaven, "which endureth" (John 6: 27, 33). When Jesus "fails" them, they "walk no more with Him." Cp. Lot's wife. We are daily exposed to the grave danger of apostasy.

B. The Holy Spirit offers the preventive for this grave danger. (1) Text, vv. 67-69. Peter says in effect: Poor, ailing, wretched, lost, sinful man has nowhere else to go but to Jesus. Cp. Hymn 334:2 ("... my *only* Consolation") and Hymn 348:1 ("... *only* Jesus can my heartfelt longing still"). "Thou hast the words of eternal life." "We believe and are sure that Thou art that Christ. . . ." Where did such conviction and loyalty come from? 1 Cor. 12:3; Matt. 16: 16, 17. The Holy Ghost works faith and preserves faith, thus preventing defection and apostasy (John 6:29; 1 Cor. 1:4-7). (2) Turn to the Spirit for continuing convictions and for unabating loyalty to Christ. Peter claimed for himself a loyalty that would never cease. This self-confidence was perilous. Jesus cautions against it (vv. 70, 71), stating that even among the Twelve, individually chosen by Him, there was not the perfect loyalty of which Peter boasted. Strong language: "one of you is a devil." Cp. John 13: 2, 27. — All those belong to Christ who are given Him by the Father, through the gracious workings of the Holy Spirit (text, v. 65; context, vv. 37, 44, 45). Preservation in the faith (and safekeeping against defection) is possible, not through man's personal strivings but solely through the "drawing" of God the Spirit (Hos. 13:9, self-sufficiency results in self-destruction; 1 Peter 1:5; 1 Thess. 2:13). To remain true to Christ alone, owning Him only as Lord and Master; to keep

"clinging to our Savior, whose blood [alone] hath bought us," pray Hymn 226:7, 8.

Conclusion: "Come, Holy Ghost, God and Lord. . . . From every error keep us free. Let none but Christ our master be."

By Way of Explanation: The two major divisions of the outline are from Hymn 224:2. This hymn may well be used as the sermon hymn, since other quotations are also drawn from its stanzas. — A careful study of the *entire* sixth chapter of John is essential to a proper understanding and full treatment of the text. Unlike some Bible chapters which have widely divergent sections wholly unrelated to one another, John 6 has a high degree of cohesion and unity, warranting detailed study *in toto*, if due justice is to be done to vv. 60-71.

Collinsville, Ill. THEODORE TEYLER

THE FEAST OF THE HOLY TRINITY

MATT. 28:16-20

We church members have been calling ourselves fortunate today because we can say that God is three-in-one. At least, that's what we said a few minutes ago when we prayed the collect: "God, who hast given us grace to acknowledge the glory of the Trinity. . . ." Why? If someone asked us to explain what we mean by "Trinity," most of us would be hard pressed to make it plain. But we're not just celebrating the fact that we know a doctrine but the great action of God the Father in sending Jesus Christ to redeem us and the Holy Spirit to bring the life of Christ to us. We're celebrating the fact that God doesn't just sit and marvel at His "three-in-oneness" but that He acts for His people. That's why, in this text, Christ makes it plain that He wants us to be a people who act to carry out the work He has given His church. We're going to see that

Our Assignment Is to Act with God to Make Disciples of All the World by Using the

Tools of Baptism and Teaching to Bring Men to Meet God, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

I. *The aim our Lord gives us: to make disciples.*

Text (v. 19 RSV). Our job as Christians is not merely to spread Christian ethics and doctrine around the world, not just to repeat the Gospel into people's ears. Much more to our task than just printing and distributing tracts and house-to-house visiting and preaching. Each of us is to be concerned that the rest of us become and remain *disciples* of the Lord. Definition: disciples are pupils of a rabbi, or teacher. They followed him about, lived in his company, obeyed him as leader. We are to help men into this kind of relationship with our Lord.

II. *The scope of our task: all the world.*

Text: "all nations." Our scope not limited by any cultural or national boundaries. Roots of this worldwide point of view are in the O.T. To Abraham: "in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed" (Gen. 22: 18); Psalms echo it (Ps. 2, 19, 24, et al.); Isaiah put it into sharp focus (ch. 60). We must be careful not to limit scope in either of two ways. Some find it easy to accept task of making disciples at home, but haven't much concern for world missions; others find it easier to give a few dollars for missions than accept responsibility for a neighbor.

III. *What we have to offer: a meeting with the triune God*

A. God is triune. Text: "In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." Introit: "The Holy Trinity and Undivided Unity." But this is not just a doctrine we try to be impressed by because it sounds incredible. This is a way of describing God as One who gets things done, One who doesn't just sit quiescent through all eternity. We see Him at work when we think about the Cross of Jesus Christ. The Father willed

it and designed the schedule of our redemption; the Son carried out the actions planned by the Father, always with the help and presence of the Father (2 Cor. 5:19) "God was in Christ . . ." (also, today's Gospel, vv. 2, 15); the Holy Spirit meets us where we are with the life Christ has won for us (today's Gospel, v. 5).

B. When we make disciples, we actually bring people to meet this God. Sometimes, in evangelistic connection, people say, "Prepare to meet thy God." Actually, when we carry out the charge of Jesus to witness, people *are* meeting God. Content of what we have to deliver to men is not just words, not just new thinking, moral reform, but the triune God.

IV. *What we have to work with: Baptism and teaching*

A. Our Lord gives us tools for making disciples. One of them is Baptism (text cf. today's Gospel, John 3:5-7). "In the name of . . ." not just a symbolic act which we do down here while God erases sins in His book up in heaven. "In the name of" means that God Himself is present, that He meets the person we baptize, enters into fellowship with him, invites him to become a disciple.

B. Christ also gives us *teaching* as a tool for making disciples. Text: "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." By teaching, we unfold the meaning of Baptism, help men understand the action of the triune God in redemption. But more, God is present when we teach Him to men, so that what we present is not mere words, but, as in Baptism, God Himself.

V. *Our task is possible*

A. When we face the task and plan of our Lord, we may be disheartened. Its scope is tremendous. We have seen opposition and resistance from the very people we are to make disciples. Church often seems to feel defeated before she starts. Church folk reach

for p
izati
them
they
cann

B
poss
Text
in h
alwa
resu
Spir
poss
need
them
wer
Chri
us.
chur
p

FIR

P
mot
base
a qu
and
by I
He
goo

S
from
sion
tele
rath
wan
thou
mu
you
are
aspi
to a
and

for projects to keep them busy and the organizational structure intact rather than throw themselves into our Lord's project, because they feel beaten, outnumbered, convinced they cannot succeed at this.

B. We need to believe once more in the possibility of the task. Jesus knew this. Text: "All authority [power] is given to Me in heaven and on earth," and "I am with you always." We've just celebrated events of the resurrection, ascension, outpouring of the Spirit—all the great signs of Christ, who possesses all authority in the universe. We need to remember these signs and cling to them because often the world looks as if Satan were king of kings and lord of lords. But Christ has all power, and He is present with us. He can and will guarantee success to His church if we just take the task and do it.

Pleasant Hill, Calif.

WM. BACKUS

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

JOHN 15:1-8

Purpose: Results count in our day. The motivation stressed in this sermon must not be based on a quota of production but on a quality of life. We are identified with Jesus and united with Him through His initiative and by His power. The goals we have are the ones He has set. They are good in themselves and good for us also. He makes our life productive.

Sometimes all it takes to keep your car from starting is a loose battery cable. Occasionally we find words we are hearing on television or in conversation or at a lecture rather meaningless because our attention has wandered and we've lost the connection of thoughts. In certain business relationships as much depends on whom you know as on what you know. We say connections and contacts are important. In this year of presidential aspirations we shall see how candidates strive to associate themselves with popular people and causes. Such connections can contribute

to success at the polls. Our text emphasizes a connection that brings success to our life according to the measure of God. It offers us an opportunity to consider

The Productive Life

I. *A productive life is directly dependent on Jesus Christ (vv. 1-4)*

A. The goal of a productive life is not as real or vital to many people as the goal of comfort, or popularity, or power, or pleasure. "He that loveth his life . . ." (John 12:25). Spiritually we are too concerned with minims.

B. Set your goal for a productive life. Let God define what a productive life is. Consider His evaluation of John's "tragic" life. (Matt. 11:11)

C. Many of life's burdens, disappointments, sorrows, and readjustments are God's process of pruning the shoots on His vine. Jesus is the Vine; the Father is the Gardener; we are the shoots (vv. 1, 2). "Chasteneth," Heb. 12:5, 6; "tried by fire," 1 Peter 1:7. These are similar pictures of purifying.

D. Life's experiences, however sweet or bitter, must be interpreted by the words of Jesus if they are to "prune" us properly. (V. 3)

E. If you leave Christ, get your goal or your motivation elsewhere, your life is futile even if it appears full. (V. 4)

II. *By a relationship to Christ we establish and increase productivity, not just production (vv. 5, 6)*

A. This relationship to Christ is best defined as consisting in the forgiveness of sins and the aspirations this forgiveness raises within us. "New creation" (2 Cor. 5:17-20). "That I may be His own and live under Him in His kingdom. . ."

B. The verdict on your efforts not related to Christ is that they are nothing. It is not the good act alone as distinguished from the bad that is important, but rather its root and

purpose even though good. (Quotations from Shelley's *Ozymandias*, or Kipling's *Recessional*, or Sandburg's *Four Preludes on Playthings of the Wind* may be useful here.)

C. The crackling of the fire burning dry thorns or weeds, or the prunings of the vineyard, orchard, or even the rosebush, illustrate the hopelessness of the destiny of those without Christ or fallen away from Him. (V. 6)

III. *Make your life productive, more productive than it has been* (vv. 7, 8)

A. To do so you will have to draw nearer to Christ. There is no other way. To do this His words are instrumental. Therefore public and private worship, Bible study, meditation on His promises, use of the sacraments are important and necessary. (V. 7)

B. Relate your past to Him in repentance, trust, and gratitude; your present with zeal and devotion; your future with anticipation and assurance. The Holy Spirit holds Jesus before you and guides you. (John 14:26)

C. It is not so much what you calling in life is, but how you fulfill it. If it is honest and useful in itself, it affords you an opportunity to be a productive Christian.

D. By being productive you do as Jesus did in His life on earth and glorify the Father. (V. 8; cf. John 12:28; 17:4)

Fairbanks, Alaska

OMAR STUENKEL

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

MATT. 11:16-26

From a letter from a former member:

"I surely was shocked the other night. I heard Joyce talking to a friend saying that she had joined the C— Church. She said 'That Church is really on the ball; they are interested in doing things for people to help them in this life. They don't preach all this Follow-Jesus junk.' And her friend retorted: 'Yes, isn't that dumb?' So, I had to speak up."

Did she? Would silence have been better? She herself added: "Don't know if it was appreciated, but I did it in a quiet manner, not wanting to start any argument, and then I let the matter drop, hoping it would be food for thought." Would it? What would *you* have done? What *do* you do in situations like this

When Facing Unbelievers?

I. *Is it safe to witness? Yes, for much unbelief is childish*

A. Jesus found it so (vv. 18 f.). John's question (context) did not stem from unbelief (no "reed," v. 7) but led Jesus to speak of His hearers' rejection ("if ye will receive it," v. 14) of both divine messengers: Of John because He did not present a bright, sociable personality or message; of Jesus because He did. Both are slandered, discarded.

B. This is like peevish children (vv. 16 f.), unwilling to play either "wedding" or "funeral." Like asking, "What *do* you want?" "I just want to be 'mad.'"

C. Like present day objections to modern preaching and witnessing: Too much "repent," too much "comfort"; too strict, too liberal; too solemn, too gay; too other-worldly, too this-worldly; often contradictory, unreasonable: condemning ours, but accepting nobody else's either. Superficial: churches too friendly, not friendly enough, etc. Prejudiced: looking for a church to suit them instead of being willing to adjust.

D. No need to be swayed by such childish objections. Real cause: Lack of "wisdom" (v. 19); unyielded will (John 7:17; 1 Cor. 2:14). But Christ remains to us the "wisdom of God" (1 Cor. 1). Our faith in Him is sure.

II. *Is it necessary to witness? Yes, for their condemnation is imminent*

A. Though childish, unbelief faces no mere juvenile court. "Day of Judgment" (vv. 22, 24) is due. Unbelief is no childish

prank, but rejects Him who is Judge of the universe. Starts in text: "began He to upbraid. . . . Woe." See damnableness of unbelief, rejecting God's gift of the Way. (John 14:6)

B. How concerned we ought to be over modern cities resembling ancient Tyre, Sidon, Sodom — predominantly "pagan" — sure of condemnation. (Rom. 1:20)

C. Even more so for our Chorazins, Bethsaidas, Capernaums — "Christian" cities and people who pass by the Christ and His churches. (Mark 16:16; Luke 12:47, 48)

D. Most of all concerned for ourselves "if we neglect so great salvation" (Heb. 2:3) — we, who have the "whole Christ," not merely the Great Teacher or Miracle Worker of Galilee (as people of Capernaum may have thought of Him) but also the Christ of Gethsemane, Gabbatha, Golgotha, the resurrection, ascension, Pentecost, session — the "Son of man" (v. 19), come to raise us to "sons of God"; the "Friends of sinners" (v. 19); the Christ of invitation, "Come unto Me." (V. 28)

E. In deep awareness of the Helper given

us, we share His spirit of deep concern to rescue the perishing by warning, witnessing. There still is time. The hour of Judgment has not yet struck.

III. *Is it of any use to witness? Yes, Christ will gain victories through us*

A. Our letter continued: "Hoping it would be food for thought; I think it was, because she brought up the subject again the other night. . . ." The last chapter for Joyce is yet to be written. God can triumph.

B. "At that time" (v. 25). Jesus thanks for faith as found in "babes." Not childish unbelief but childlike faith is God's goal (v. 26). See evidences in our own church of victory through witnessing of Christ. God's wisdom has "children" who justify His truth. (Matt. 18:3)

C. Some will reject the greatest preachers of all times (John, James), yet God will win Gospel victories through "babes" like us!

Is it safe? necessary? any use? (Acts 4:20)

"So I had to speak up" (letter).

Honolulu, Hawaii

WINFRED A. SCHROEDER

THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER

THE GOSPEL OF THOMAS — LOGIA IESOU?

The *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* (January 1960), under this heading, offers a very helpful analysis of the apocryphal *Gospel of Thomas*, which came to light in 1947 and was published in Cairo in 1956. But already in 1952 it had been identified with a work well known through three fragments of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri. In a "conclusion" the writer summarizes the picture which scholars now have of the origin of this apocryphon. It is presumably of Jewish-Christian origin. The original place of its composition seems to have been Edessa in Syria and the time, the early second century. The present Coptic text is evidently a translation from Greek. The original may have been a compilation from various sources, some of them at least originally Aramaic. The original compilers of the apocryphon probably were not Gnostics, though when it was included in the Gnostic library it may have undergone some sort of revision at the hands of Gnostics. The document is important for various reasons. First, it is the complete document of the fragments represented formerly by the Oxyrhynchus *logoi Iesou*. Again, it affords us an excellent example of an ancient form of apocryphal Jewish-Christian literature. Nevertheless, the textual value of the synoptic-type sayings seems to be slight, and it is extremely doubtful that we shall ever be able to say with assurance that any given logion of Thomas represents a genuine hitherto lost saying of Jesus. In an "addendum" R. M. Grant (*Notes on the Gospel of Thomas*) is quoted as stating: "We cannot expect to find any authentic sayings of Jesus accurately reproduced in it."

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

A STUDY IN EXEGESIS

Interpretation (January 1960), under this heading, publishes a review of *The Midrash*

on *Psalms* (Midrash Tehillim), translated from the Hebrew and Aramaic by Rabbi W. G. Braude, Vol. XIII of the *Yale Judaica Series* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959). A "Midrash," the reviewer says, denotes a didactic or homiletic exposition of Scripture, though it can be applied also to a religious interpretation of history. The reviewer offers a number of samples of Midrash exegesis to give the reader the trend of thought and the type of exegesis here presented. The exegesis on Ps. 137:1 may serve as a fair example of what the *Midrash Tehillim* has to offer the reader. The text reads: "By the rivers of Babylon there we sat down," and this is the given exposition: "This is explained as indicating that from the time the exiles left Jerusalem until they reached the Euphrates they had not been allowed to sit down. Rabbi Johanan, however, says that the Euphrates slew more Israelites than Nebuchadnezzar. In Palestine they drank only rain water, running water, or spring water; but when they drank of the Euphrates, they died. So they wept for the dead, including those whom the Babylonians had not permitted to be buried." The reviewer remarks on this exposition: "Manifestly the pastor cannot use this kind of exegesis in preparing his sermons; the preacher who does solid biblical work will have to employ the grammatico-historical method." He adds in conclusion: "The parish minister . . . would not receive an adequate theological return for his financial investment." In another article in the same journal, "The Interpreter and the Parables," the writer says *inter alia*: "As an interpreter, Luther's principles were much better than his own practice. He dismissed the allegorizing method as 'monkey tricks' (*Affenspiel*)," but in practice remained quite hospitable to the allegories of the Fathers. His own sermon on the "Good Samaritan" shows as many

"mon
praise
ing o
interp
In fa
stated
stance
gram
ogniz
other
guilty
Chris
body

At
in m
p. 59
Laets
his o
Moel
schol

BRIE
N
chos
Luth
its n
Chur

R
in r
here
the
nom
of 1

A
boar
of t
Phil

T
nam
subs
ther
char
thre

"monkey tricks" as Origen's. The writer then praises Calvin, who pronounced the allegorizing of the Fathers "idle fooleries," as the finest interpreter of the parables since Chrysostom. In fairness to Luther, however, it should be stated that, while allegorizing in some instances, he quite consistently followed the grammatico-historical method, which he recognized as the only correct mode. On the other hand the Reformed divines became guilty of allegorizing when interpreting Christ's words of institution "This is My body; this is My blood." (Matt. 26:26, 28)

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

Attention has been called to a misquotation in my article in the August, 1958, CTM, p. 590, footnote 84. The context of Dr. Laetsch's words makes clear that this is *not* his own viewpoint; on the contrary, he finds Moeller's attention to refutation of critical scholars completely justifiable.

D. R. HILLERS

BRIEF ITEMS FROM LUTHERAN SOURCES

New York.—New York City has been chosen national headquarters of a proposed Lutheran body of three million members, and its name has been changed to the "Lutheran Church in America."

Representatives of the four bodies engaged in merger negotiations voted unanimously here in favor of New York over Chicago as the site for the main offices of the new denomination they hope to establish by June of 1962.

At the same time it was agreed that certain boards, commissions, auxiliaries, and agencies of the merged church should be located in Philadelphia, Chicago, and Minneapolis.

The union negotiators also approved the name "Lutheran Church in America," as a substitute for their original choice of "Lutheran Evangelical Church in America." The change was voted by 35 to 10 after more than three hours of discussion.

Action on headquarters and name was taken here by the Joint Commission on Lutheran Unity, composed of 46 commissioners from the United Lutheran Church in America, Augustana Lutheran Church, Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Church or Suomi Synod, and American Evangelical Lutheran Church.

Geneva.—A prominent German Lutheran theologian has expressed the opinion that any church law authorizing the general ordination of women to the Christian ministry "attacks fundamental laws and commands of God" contained in Holy Scriptures.

Prof. Peter Brunner of Heidelberg has questioned whether the Swedish and Danish laws which provide for such ordination "rest on a general philosophy of life which has its roots in the Enlightenment and in the Idealism of the 19th century" rather than on the church's "witness that she is bound to Christ and to His Gospel."

Dr. Brunner, a member of the Lutheran World Federation Commission on Theology, gave his theological views on women pastors in the latest issue of the federation's quarterly, *Lutheran World*, published here.

He noted that the "confessional standards," or official doctrinal writings of Lutheranism, "do not express themselves on the problem" and that "an answer to the question whether or not women should be ordained to the pastoral ministry . . . is only possible by drawing theological conclusions from them."

The focal "theological conclusion" drawn by the University of Heidelberg professor was that "the combinations of being 'woman' and being 'pastor' contradict one another in a manner which involves the woman in the hidden depths of her created being in a conflict which attacks her very being."

This conflict between being "pastor" and being "woman" is "so hidden that empirical symptoms thereof are perhaps not apparent for a long time, perhaps not for an entire generation," he acknowledged. "It is quite possible that the combination . . . might for

a long time . . . be accompanied by the best of results.

"But finally the day will come when this conflict, which is built up in the hidden depths of created being, will manifest its great force even through empirical symptoms. In the long run it will eventually take its toll in the total cultural structure of an era."

He asserted that "an argument which believes it can derive a case for the ordination of women from the changed position of the woman in modern society has no validity in the church."

"We must take into account the theological doctrine of the sexual difference between man and woman as found in the Bible," Dr. Brunner said. "The church . . . cannot be satisfied to borrow the insights of biology, psychology, philosophy, sociology, or medicine."

The difference, he contended, is that God created man as "head" of woman and her as "subordinate" to him.

This relationship, "which was given at the creation, has not been obviated by the event of Christ, but has finally come into the light and has been brought into its own with new power and in a new way," the German theologian said. "(It is) in effect in the Christian church until the last Judgment.

"Were anyone to contest, in teaching and preaching, the factual and effective existence of this order and the factual validity of the corresponding command, he would be proclaiming a false teaching in regard to this central point, with which the whole Christian message hangs together. He would be a heretic."

Dr. Brunner explained that in speaking of the "subordination" of woman he was "dealing with a theological and not with a sociological relationship."

In further clarification he stated: "The woman is not a member of the (Christian) congregation with lesser rank. In regard to the reception of the Holy Ghost and His gifts the woman, as woman, is in no way preju-

diced against, since she is just as much a member of the body of Christ as is the man."

He added, however, that "this does not eliminate the fact that there are various ministries in the church . . . for which the very fact of being man or being woman . . . can under certain circumstances be of great importance."

The Heidelberg professor of systematic theology qualified his general conclusion by mentioning three possible kinds of Christian ministry that might Biblically be open to women:

1. They might under rare circumstances be called as "prophets" by direct divine action, even though not by church law authorizing their ordination and appointment as regular parish preachers.

2. According to the Reformer Martin Luther they might serve as spiritual heads of congregations which contained no men or at least no men qualified and divinely inspired to preach.

3. They might be installed as assistant ministers of congregations having men as head pastors, performing certain subordinate functions, of which Dr. Brunner offered a suggested list of "mays" and "may nots."

Stockholm.—After smoldering for several months Sweden's dispute over the ordination of women has burst into flame, setting off a new crucial period in the life of this country's national Lutheran Church.

In rapid succession late in January:

1. Archbishop Gunnar Hultgren of Uppsala, primate of the church, announced at the close of a bishops' conference, where the matter had been discussed anew, that it had been decided to delay no longer in admitting women theological graduates to the Swedish Lutheran ministry.

2. Led by Bishop Bo Giertz of Gothenburg, the church's "confessional front" organization met and planned ways by which church members could be encouraged to show their non-

recogn
be or

3
in th
publi
disob
and r

In
a pre
know
both
the m
of or

He
churc
consi
made
victi
bisho
the c

Th
ologi
and
feren

Dr
rite f
dates,
St. C
Comm
of C
bisho
Stock
nösar

Bi
the p
as "th
the R
we w

Sp
fessio
that
in th
they
He n
consi

recognition of any women pastors that may be ordained.

3. In various Swedish press organs and in three legal complaints Bishop Giertz was publicly accused of inciting the people to disobey a law passed by the national Riksdag and ratified by the church assembly.

In announcing the ordination decision at a press conference Archbishop Hultgren acknowledges that the bishops were divided both on the principle of equality of sexes in the ministry and on the practical desirability of ordaining women at this time.

He said, however, that the danger of the church's being split over such a move was considerably less than when the new law first made it possible a year ago. He voiced conviction that any further indecision on the bishops' part would harm rather than help the church.

The prelate said applications of three theologically trained women have been accepted and that each would be ordained by a different bishop in March.

Dr. Hultgren himself will officiate at the rite for the most outstanding of the candidates, Dr. Margit Sahlin, director of the St. Catherine's Foundation and a Central Committee member of the World Council of Churches. The other two ordaining bishops will be Dr. Helge Ljungberg of Stockholm and Dr. Ruben Josefson of Härnösand.

Bishop Giertz, for his part, characterized the present situation of the Church of Sweden as "the most serious one [it has faced] since the Reformation" — a situation "I had hoped we would avoid as far as possible."

Speaking as head of the Bible- and Confession-Centered Church Fellowship, he said that as long as its members are able to stay in the national church and work for what they believe is right, it is their duty to do so. He reiterated, however, that the group still considered that the final alternative would be

to form a free Lutheran Church in this country.

The fellowship, at its meeting immediately after the Archbishop's press statement, mapped a program of counteraction for church people opposed to the introduction of women ministers. It counseled refusal to accept the conduct of worship services or pastoral acts at the hands of women pastors. For Baptism, weddings, and funerals, people were advised to ask for the privilege of using the services of another pastor.

Spokesmen of the organization stressed that it was fighting not against persons but against a kind of ordination which it believes cannot be valid, because it contravenes Biblical command. They said the cause to which the fellowship is dedicated is the church's faithfulness to Scriptural doctrine.

One of its leaders, Dean G. A. Danell of Växjö, declared: "We emphasize obedience to God rather than to man and the fact that nothing is more dangerous than to go against one's conscience."

Confessional front spokesmen said it has already received from different parts of the country many messages of support and contributions.

Much of the press comment, however, has been unsympathetic. Some papers have argued with the authors of the legal complaints that public officials — which includes bishops of the state church — cannot be permitted to lead a public campaign to hinder the implementation of a national law.

Archbishop Hultgren, in announcing plans to ordain the first Swedish Lutheran women clergy, said the theologically trained aspirants had delayed applying for a full year to avoid splitting the church. The first application was received in January, shortly before the bishops' conference.

The primate's statement that he himself would ordain one of the women was interpreted as a gesture to signify that the church officially accepted the new law.

Bishop Ljungberg will officiate at the rite for Miss Elisabeth Djurle, a 28-year-old student counselor at Uppsala, who has also been serving as parish worker in a Stockholm congregation. The council of this congregation is supporting her application with an offer of regular pastoral employment.

Bishop Josefson is to ordain Miss Ingrid Persson, who has been working at a nursing home in Uppsala and who is to take over a pastorate in the diocese of Härnösand.

The third candidate, Dr. Sahlin, who is 46, will be ordained in the chapel of St. Catherine's Foundation, of which she will continue as director.

BRIEF ITEMS FROM RELIGIOUS NEWS SERVICE

Glen Head, N. Y. — The first junior-senior Lutheran parochial high school on the East Coast will be ready here for students this fall.

A \$1,000,000 institution, the school will be operated on a 33-acre site by the Lutheran High School Association of Nassau and Suffolk Counties of The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod.

The Rev. Elmer F. Eggold, executive director of the association, said plans provide for an initial enrollment of 400 to 500 students in grades 7 through 9. One additional grade (10—12) will be established each succeeding year to complete the curriculum, with an anticipated enrollment of 800 to 1,000 in the six-year program.

More than 100 pupils have already been registered for a future elementary division, Mr. Eggold noted.

Construction of classroom facilities is scheduled to start early this spring. Only a few rooms in an existing mansion on the property will be used for classes, the association director said.

There are more than 30 Missouri Synod congregations, with nearly 26,000 baptized members, in Nassau and Suffolk counties.

Mr. Eggold said interest in parochial education implies no criticism of the public school system. He pointed out that his church teaches that every church member, as a part of society, has a responsibility to support public schools.

The denomination operates a total of 1,284 parochial elementary schools and 27 high schools in the United States and Canada.

Geneva. — European Lutheran settlers in South Africa, who have worshiped in their mother tongues for many years, now sense a need to begin tying their church life linguistically to the country in which they are living.

This was reported here by Director Bengt Hoffman of the Lutheran World Federation's Department of World Service on returning to his office from a four-week official visit to that country.

Most church leaders of South Africa's 30,000 Scandinavians and German evangelicals, he said, have come to realize the necessity of introducing religious facilities in English and Afrikaans for their younger generation.

"It is the key to the future survival of the Lutheran congregations among South Africans of European descent," he declared.

THE
gin
Tot
by
Ha
Clo
Aft
of the
genea
discus
cludes
are to
that n
to the
tellect
the tw
appro
for an
Phari
fulness
ence
is obs
pressi
the p
interc
comm
and
celest
Schul
of er
demi
Qum
series
scroll
Chris
TH
of co
be e
and

BOOK REVIEW

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 South Jefferson Avenue, St. Louis 18, Missouri.

THE DEAD SEA COMMUNITY: Its Origins and Teachings (*Die Gemeinde vom Toten Meer*). By Kurt Schubert. Translated by John W. Doberstein. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959. xi + 178 pages. Cloth. \$3.75.

After detailing the history of the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Schubert traces the genealogy of the Qumran community and discusses the theology of the scrolls. He concludes that the members of the community are to be classed as part of a larger complex that may be called Essene. They are related to the Pharisees by virtue of a common intellectual ancestry through the Hasidim, but the two groups diverge in their eschatological approach. The Qumran community looked for an imminent Messianic age, whereas the Pharisees "sought to reconcile a life of faithfulness to the law with a continuing existence in the world" (p.40). A close affinity is observable between the eschatological expression at Qumran and the apocalyptic of the pseudepigraphical writings. Of special interest is Schubert's identification of the common denominator between Gnosticism and apocalyptic, namely, insight into the celestial mysteries; but it should be noted, Schubert is careful to point out, that a theory of emanations and the concept of an evil demiurge is foreign to the thinking at Qumran. The volume concludes with a series of illuminating studies relating the scrolls to the New Testament, the rise of Christianity, and later Judaism.

This volume presents the distilled essence of competent scholarship in a form that can be easily assimilated by the average pastor and layman. For a multidimensional view of

Qumran and its scrolls, this is the book to consult; the screen is wide, but the distortion factor is held to a minimum.

FREDERICK W. DANKER

GNOSTICISM AND EARLY CHRISTIANITY. By Robert M. Grant. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959. vii + 227 pages. Cloth. \$4.50.

This latest volume in the series "Lectures on the History of Religions" presents the thesis that Gnosticism arose out of the debris of apocalyptic Judaism after the fall of Jerusalem, though the author does not disregard the contributions of Hellenistic and Iranian thought. After defining Gnosticism as a revelation leading to self-knowledge expressed in a great variety of myths and cultic observances, Grant gives an overview of Jewish history from the Maccabees to Simon-bar-Kosiba.

After a chapter on the heavenly world in Judaism, succeeding chapters pass in review the systems of Simon Magus, Saturninus, the *Apocryphon of John*, Marcion, Valentinus, Basilides, Numenius, and the *Hermetica*. The last two are read out of the Gnostic pack for lack of a savior and for a gnosis that included more than self-knowledge. (Is Grant here using the thesis he sets out to prove to rule out evidence that would modify it?)

The last chapter traces Gnostic motives in New Testament writings. He finds Paul and John closest to Gnosticism in language, yet "not Gnostic in content" (p.174). In both he finds "mythological" language. In neither case does he mention the great frequency of πίστις (Paul) or πιστεύειν (Paul and John), terms as un-Gnostic as can be found (cf.

p. 7). For this implies that in accord with Grant's own basic thesis (which is very convincing) Gnosticism must have arisen after A.D. 70, when Jerusalem, the center of apocalyptic hopes, disappeared. The establishment of Aelia Capitolina of A.D. 130 must have been the death blow to its reappearance.

The book has an excellent bibliography and index.

EDGAR KRENTZ

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF HEROD THE GREAT. By Stewart Perowne. New York: Abingdon Press, 1959. 187 pages. Cloth. \$5.50.

This is a popular and thoroughly engrossing account of one of history's colorful and intriguing figures. The author aims to rectify the distorted impression many people have of the man who slaughtered the Innocents. Without denying the madness and the pettiness of Herod's mind as evidenced especially in his declining years, Perowne sympathetically restores the portrait of a spirited builder of public works, of a man of extraordinary administrative ability, of a wily politician who not only successfully matched wits with shrewd Romans, but who also practiced with rare finesse the art of survival amid dispossessed and nationalistically crazed Hasmonaeans.

A keen sense of dramatic values interplays with an organized grasp of complex historical data. Reader interest is maintained down to the last pages, which offer a modern medical diagnosis of Herod's fatal disease. There are also a few gallant paragraphs on Cleopatra.

Final verdict: Herod never had it so good!

FREDERICK W. DANKER

JOSEPHUS: THE JEWISH WAR. Translated by G. A. Williamson. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1959. 411 pages plus maps. Paper. \$1.25.

The translator has succeeded well in turning Josephus' sometimes involved periods

into fluent English. Aimed at the lay reader (not the scholar), the translation expresses ancient monetary terms, place names, and chronological expressions in modern equivalents. One regrets, first, that there is no index, and, second, that the book is glued rather than gathered and sewn (like the Penguin Tacitus), for the reading that it invites will soon crack its back. Nevertheless, as a version, it is so superior to Whiston that it is heartily recommended.

EDGAR KRENTZ

JAHRBUCH FÜR ANTIKE UND CHRISTENTUM, I. Münster-in-Westfalen: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1958. 160 pages, 10 figures, 8 plates. Cloth, DM 17.50; paper, DM 15.00

To review a new journal is not easy. Rather than evaluate the specific contributions in hand *per se*, one must ask if the journal is really a necessary addition to the plethora of journals already in the field. By this standard the new *Jahrbuch* is an outstanding addition to our periodical literature.

There are many journals that welcome contributions on the literary history of early Christianity, e.g., *Vigiliae Christianae*, *Traditio*, *Journal of Theological Studies*. But only few of them are willing to accept materials dealing with the development of early Christian culture, since these usually need expensive drawings, plates, etc., to elucidate the text.

The new *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* will fill this gap, as its first issue makes abundantly clear. The articles, all by eminent authorities, cover such topics as the sign of the cross, the origins of early Christian art, early throne symbolism, and the excavations under St. Peter's in Rome. It also serves as a supplement to the *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, four volumes of which have been published by the Franz Joseph Dölger-Institut of the University of Bonn. The present volume has outstanding articles on "Aethiopia" and "Amen."

All students of the New Testament, early Christian history, and early Christian art will find this journal a valuable repository of significant articles. We hail its birth and wish it a long and fruitful life.

EDGAR KRENTZ

STATISTIK DES NEUTESTAMENTLICHEN WORTSCHATZES. By Robert Morgenthaler. Zurich: Gotthelf-Verlag, 1958. 188 pages. Boards. \$6.50.

The Greek text of Nestle (21st ed.) has 137,490 words; the total vocabulary of the New Testament contains upward of 5,400; *xai* is used 4,947 times (818 in the Gospel of John); Romans has a vocabulary of 1,068 words; 42.5 per cent of the vocabulary of Ephesians is made up of nouns; the New Testament employs 1,934 words only once; it contains 27 Latin words used 92 times. How long did it take to gather this information? No longer than it took to put these words down on paper, thanks to the magnificent new tool put into the hands of scholars by Morgenthaler of Bern University. How often have we spent precious minutes laboriously counting out in our concordance the frequency of a given word in the entire New Testament or in one of its writers! That drudgery is now ended. The construction of frequency lists, vocabulary lists for any single author or book, the checking on the tables of Harrison's *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*—practically anything that calls for statistics in New Testament studies—is greatly facilitated by Morgenthaler's self-sacrificing labors. The backbone of the book covers 90 pages, presenting in alphabetical order the whole New Testament vocabulary (no word definitions, hence superb for vocabulary reviews), with columns showing the occurrence or nonoccurrence of each word in each writing—a separate column totaling the use in Paul, another the total for all books, another setting forth the use or non-use in the Septuagint. Thirty further pages

draw on this major section for a large number of statistical tables on varying matters of interest, such as selected phenomena of grammar, frequency lists for each writer, vocabulary relations among various groups of writings. Of course, one can do without this book (there seems to have been none like this for 1,900 years, nor does it seem likely that the work must be done again), but the book once held in hand in a library and used alongside of concordance and lexicon, one will almost certainly desire to own a copy and have it within arm's reach in one's private study. A 60-page commentary on the tables heads the book. It is in German, but an alert non-German can get returns from the tables without the commentary, although these returns will be considerably reduced.

VICTOR BARTLING

THE FIRST AND SECOND EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS. By Leon Morris. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1959. 274 pages. Cloth. \$4.00.

Of the volumes published thus far in the New International Commentary on the New Testament, this is one of the most thorough and knowledgeable. Sensitive linguistic tact is combined with a generally firm grasp of Paul's argument.

FREDERICK W. DANKER

ANCIENT JUDAISM AND THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Frederick C. Grant. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1959. xvii + 155 pages. Cloth. \$3.50.

The distinguished professor of Biblical theology at Union Theological Seminary makes an impassioned plea in this book for a more sympathetic understanding of the profound debt Christianity owes to Judaism. The basic theme is: The theology of Old Testament Jewish piety more than any other factor lies behind the thinking of Jesus and the early church. Nor are we surprised to

read in this context that the church's approach to the Bible is best made along liturgical and not dogmatical lines.

Since the author desires to awaken the reader's sympathies for the values in Judaism, it might have been helpful to spell out more specifically a bibliographical nucleus. More adequate documentation of the writer's judgments and evaluations would have made the book more useful to pastors and seminary students. Thus it is difficult to assess a statement like this: "The Old Testament was in use by the church from the start" (p. 122). Gerhard Kunze, "Die Lesungen," in *Leiturgia*, II (Kassel, 1955), 88—179, suggests a far more complex situation. On the other hand, the chapter on the synagog is one of the most lucid discussions available on the subject.

No minister of the Gospel who considers seriously his responsibility to understand the New Testament in its cultural and religious context can ignore this book.

FREDERICK W. DANKER

HEILIGENGRÄBER IN JESU UMWELT (MT. 23, 29; LK. 11, 47): *EINE UNTERSUCHUNG ZUR VOLKSRELIGION DER ZEIT JESU*. By Joachim Jeremias. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1958. 155 pages. Paper, DM 15.80; cloth, DM 19.80.

"Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for you build the tombs of the prophets and adorn the monuments of the righteous" (Matt. 23:29 RSV). Jeremias has provided an excellent commentary on this verse and its parallel in Luke 11 in the present work. After an evaluation of the literary sources (Jewish, Mohammedan, and Christian) and pertinent modern literature, the author discusses 49 sites of the Near East connected by tradition with the burial of Old Testament and intertestamental figures. He concludes (p. 114) that 10 (including those of Joseph, Isaiah, and the Patriarchs) rest

on a tradition already current in the time of Christ.

After a short discussion of the archaeological evidence for the appearance of the graves, he examines the literary traditions for evidence of thaumaturgic and intercessory narratives on the part of the "Holy Fathers." He finds evidence of both as well as a cult of relics. Official Rabbinic Judaism reacted against this tendency.

Jeremias' own conclusion (p. 144) underscores the importance of this work: "Zum Verständnis des Hintergrundes der Predigt Jesu darf man sich nicht lediglich auf die offizielle . . . Theologie seiner Umwelt stützen, sondern ebenso wichtig, wenn nicht noch wichtiger, ist die Kenntnis der Volksreligion seiner Zeit." EDGAR KRENTZ

A HANDBOOK OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY. Edited by Marvin Halverson. New York: Living Age Books (Meridian Books), 1958. 380 pages. Paper. \$1.45.

The variation in quality of the articles contained in a symposium or collection of essays tends to be a function of the number of contributors; there are 71 in the current volume. Most of them are big names. Lutheran contributors include Paul Althaus, Conrad Bergendoff, Jerald Brauer, George Lindbeck, Anders Nygren, Jaroslav Pelikan, and Warren Quanbeck. The essays themselves are alphabetically arranged, from Adam and Second Adam, through Catholicism, Destiny and Fate, Existential Philosophy, *Heilsgeschichte*, Justice, Man, Paradox, Reformation, and Sermon, to Vocation. The choice of subjects is excellent. The two-to-five-title bibliographies are admirably chosen. Most of these succinct articles are authoritatively written, although unwarranted generalizations and oversimplifications are (like the bad proofreading of foreign words and phrases) irritatingly obtrusive on occasion. All in all, "the emergent emphases and new directions

in Pr
Unite
of th
twent
useful

THE
AP
Ton
ma
pag
Th
of a
very
the A
usage
cont
survi
holds
and C
man's
deter
(with
Helle
Gosp
doctr
to ad
the p
Or
Apos
quain
were
day -
say,
never
wish
from

MO
sl
Pr
19
T
by P
cons

in Protestant thought, particularly in the United States of America," that this "record of the theological situation of the [mid]-twentieth century" is designed to expose are usefully delineated.

ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN

THE DOCTRINE OF GRACE IN THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS. By Thomas F. Torrance. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1959. vii + 150 pages. Cloth. \$3.00.

The present book is an American edition of a most thorough and precise study of one very important concept in the theology of the Apostolic Fathers. The author traces the usage of *χάρις* and related terms in every context. Torrance is highly critical of the surviving Apostolic Fathers. For them, he holds, grace had become a subsidiary concept, and Christianity was envisioned in terms of man's acts toward God. He explains this deterioration by the intrusion of Judaism (with its emphasis upon Law), coupled with Hellenism (with its naturalism), upon the Gospel. Along with their distortion of the doctrine of grace the Apostolic Fathers failed to adequately appreciate either the death or the person of Christ.

One sometimes wonders whether the few Apostolic Fathers with whom we are acquainted (because we have their writings) were in all cases the spokesmen of their day—and the only spokesmen; that is to say, whether the theology of their time was never better than what they propounded. One wishes that there were more writings extant from this important era.

ROBERT D. PREUS

MORE ABOUT LUTHER: Vol. II. By Jaroslav Pelikan, Regin Prenter, and Herman Preus. Decorah: Luther College Press, 1959. 214 pages. Cloth. \$2.75.

The first essay "Luther and the Liturgy" by Pelikan offers a sound review of Luther's conservative liturgical opinions and practice.

Liturgy was to meet the people where they were, but also to lead them into a deeper appreciation of their faith. To Luther "liturgical form is in reverse ratio to the earnestness of Christian faith." The higher the degree of sanctification, the less need for formal liturgy. Taking his cue from Luther, Pelikan offers a few suggestions of his own for making liturgy more meaningful and helpful today.

Regin Prenter's essay, "Luther on Word and Sacrament," seeks to show the close connection between Word and Sacrament in Luther's theology. He brings out clearly Luther's strong emphasis on the personal and ongoing covenant nature of Baptism, an emphasis which needs to be made again today. Of course, Luther's teaching on Word and Sacrament derives from his theology of the cross, and Prenter is quick to point this out. Prenter's method is to quote Luther at length, and then to comment very extensively—a method which to this reviewer seems very helpful. Regrettable is the fact that Prenter arbitrarily confines his study to Luther's early utterances, although in the present essay little distortion results.

Herman Preus writes on "The Christian and the Church." He points to Luther's respectful and humble attitude toward the church, even in the midst of his struggle with the papacy. The Christian cannot live alone; he needs the fellowship which is to be found in the church. Luther continually reminds the believer of the riches he possesses as a member of Christ's church. Also in Luther's discussions on the church we note his strong emphasis on Word and Sacraments.

ROBERT D. PREUS

THE ROLE OF KNOWLEDGE IN WESTERN RELIGION. By John Herman Randall, Jr. Boston: Starr King Press, 1958. x + 147 pages. Cloth. \$3.50.

Three main positions, according to Randall, have been held in the West on the

place of knowledge and truth in religious life. (1) Christianity offers a revelation of truth, enshrined in the Bible; the evidence for this truth is revelation, and no other evidence can stand against it. (2) Christianity offers truth qualitatively different from all other truth; Christian truth is not accessible to human reason, but belongs to the realm of grace. (3) Religion is only a way of acting and feeling, not of knowing; religious "beliefs" are not based on facts outside us, but are only theological symbols expressing our feelings and yearnings. This third view is favored by the author.

He contends that the only way we can speak of "truth" in religion is in the sense in which one might speak of truth in art. As an artist may move us to action or "teach" us to open our eyes, so religion may "teach" us about ourselves or our place in the world. But this is not knowledge, it has nothing to do with what is true or false, it is not a *knowing that* but only a sort of "know-how." Meanwhile the religious person must strive to bring his fluctuating religious "beliefs" into accord with science—which of course is a never-ending task. In other words, we employ our intellects and science to judge, criticize, and clarify new religious ideas.

This is not the position of historic Christianity with its living God, who acts and speaks. In turn, Randall's type of religion, built on skepticism, will never satisfy. It is hard for one to commit oneself to what one does not and cannot know. We might ask, Is a purely formal commitment ever possible?

ROBERT D. PREUS

LOVE AND JUSTICE: SELECTIONS FROM THE SHORTER WRITINGS OF REINHOLD NIEBUHR. Edited by D. B. Robertson. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957. 309 pages. Cloth. \$6.00.

For the many people in whose view Reinhold Niebuhr's greatest contribution to con-

temporary American theology has been in the application of his realistic doctrine of man to the field of social and political ethics, the 64 articles and editorials (averaging four pages apiece in length) in this Niebuhr reader will supply the confirmation of their conviction. Although the topical arrangement obscures it somewhat, we have here a chronicle of a quarter of a century of profound changes in our international, national, and social life the extent of which even we who have lived through them are likely to forget. (That the same quarter of a century has brought profound changes in Niebuhr's own thought, in spite of basic consistencies, is also obvious from the book.) The basic theme is important and relevant in itself; in the discussion of its implications Niebuhr is at his brilliant best, as even those who dissent from his theology and who are exasperated by his politics will agree. Robertson has done a good job of selection; he deserves a vote of thanks for saving some admirable essays from the oblivion of the shadowy shelves where librarians store their bound copies of ephemeral periodicals.

ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN

THE CHRISTIAN MESSAGE AND MYTH.

By L. Malevez. Translated by Olive Wyon. London: SCM Press, 1958. 215 pages. Cloth. \$5.75.

This volume, written by a professor at the Jesuit Philosophical and Theological College of St. Albert, Louvain, offers a meticulous and discerning critique of all the bewildering and paradoxical Bultmanniana which have come out and of the possible divergent interpretations of this material.

Bultmann, by taking God's act in Christ out of history and by denying that Christ is in any sense even a *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* (which would be mythological), has undercut the entire Christology and soteriology of Christianity, i. e., the incarnation and vicarious satisfaction. There is no divine event, no eschatological

reality, except within the personal commitment of the present moment. Malevez judges therefore that Bultmann has taken away his Lord. The historic Christ no longer has anything to do with our salvation. All that concerns us is the message.

Bultmann claims that his demythologizing process was already begun by Paul. This is ridiculous, according to Malevez. Bultmann's trouble springs from his adherence to the old objection to miracle. Actually, says the author, the scientific world view today is no more incompatible with traditional Christianity than the world view in Paul's day. Science has no authority (and to say this is no mere appeal to the conception of atomic physics) to establish a principle of determinism which would outlaw miracles. Neither science nor religion refuses a priori to accept the idea of a possible divine intervention into the phenomenal world.

Malevez' conclusion is that a new religion is being preached to us, a religion with the purely human authority of its author, a religion reduced to mere preaching (without worship, without sacraments, without assurance of life after death), a religion which has no more attraction for the modern mind than that which Bultmann left behind.

There is one fault which mars an otherwise excellent book. The author has the disturbing habit of linking Bultmann with Luther, as though radical demythologizing is the logical result of Luther's doctrine of justification. But any idea of transcendence which would prevent a divine irruption into the human sphere is as foreign to Luther as anyone who ever lived. And even Malevez will grant that faith clings to what is unseen.

ROBERT D. PREUS

OUR KNOWLEDGE OF GOD. By John Baillie. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1959. 261 pages. Cloth. \$4.00.

This two-decade-old reissue begins with a blast against Barth for his denial of a natural knowledge of God. Baillie argues that

a total obliteration of the image of God in man could only mean the total obliteration of his humanity. But he goes too far in the opposite direction from Barth, and asserts that there is a saving knowledge of God apart from the Gospel.

Baillie teaches that there is in every man a knowledge of God. It is to this knowledge (Bonaventura called it the *desiderium naturale videndi Deum*) that we appeal when we discuss the existence of God with the doubter or unbeliever. Such a person must be shown that although he may deny God with the top of his head he still believes in his heart. Thus Baillie argues that many may believe in God without knowing that they believe.

Baillie rejects all a posteriori arguments for God. His neo-orthodox personalist position is that we are simply confronted by the living God. Therefore he rejects Thomism on the one hand and Kantianism on the other hand. This direct knowledge of God is in contrast to knowing things about God. Baillie is opposed to all vain speculation about God, and here he sides not only with Luther but also with Kant.

This book might be said to be apologetic in purpose. As such it is bound to be provocative inasmuch as it approaches many vexing questions from an unusual viewpoint.

ROBERT D. PREUS

LIFE AGAINST DEATH: THE PSYCHOANALYTICAL MEANING OF HISTORY. By Norman O. Brown. Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1958. xii + 366 pages. Cloth. \$6.50.

Born of a deep study of Freud, demanding (in the author's words) a willing suspension of common sense, positing with Freud mankind's death instinct and general neurosis, and attempting a synthesis of psychoanalysis with anthropology and history, this work has not bested the mysteries of life and death or the meaning of history. Brown's knowledge of Freud seems profound enough. His knowl-

edge of Luther, in spite of references to the St. Louis edition of the *Sämtliche Schriften*, is based on Grisar. Where did the *Turmerlebnis* take place? The heated room, to this psychoanalyst, was a privy. "Psychoanalysis, alas! cannot agree that it is of no significance that the religious experience which inaugurated Protestant theology took place in a privy" (p. 203). Or take these two sentences, consecutive in the text, but the second beginning a new paragraph (pp. 317 f.): "An organism whose own sexual life is as disordered as man's is in no position to construct objective theories about the Yin and the Yang and the sex life of the universe. The resurrection of the body is a social project facing mankind as a whole, and it will become a practical political problem when the statesmen of the world are called upon to deliver happiness instead of power, when political economy becomes a science of use-values instead of exchange-values — a science of enjoyment instead of a science of accumulation." This reviewer cannot "question old assumptions" or "entertain new possibilities" (p. ix) with this author. Nix! He needs a safer guide.

CARL S. MEYER

CHRISTIANITY IN A REVOLUTIONARY AGE: A HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE NINETEENTH AND TWENTIETH CENTURIES. Volume II: *The Nineteenth Century in Europe: The Protestant and Eastern Churches.* By Kenneth Scott Latourette. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959. xi + 532 pages. Cloth. \$7.00.

With tremendous scope Yale's distinguished Sterling Professor-Emeritus of Missions and Oriental History details the history of Protestantism in Europe between 1815 and 1914. In briefer compass (about 60 pages) he turns to Russia, Greece, and the Balkan countries. Even Iceland is not neglected, though it commands only two pages. Generalizations

by way of introduction, and summaries by way of perspective and appraisal, give meaning to the multitudinous details heaped up in some of the sections. The work is documented, more often with secondary authorities than with primary sources. Sometimes mistakes have crept in, e.g., Schleiermacher died in 1834 not in 1839 (p. 12), the famines came to Holland in the mid-1840s not the 1940s (p. 241). The bibliography is full. Even with all his wealth of detail there are still areas which Latourette neglects, e.g., liturgy and hymnology — Catherine Winkworth is not so much as mentioned. But for all that, where else can one find such a comprehensive coverage? Latourette has set for himself the goal of completing three more volumes. The first two already make this a modern reference work of importance.

CARL S. MEYER

BLAISE PASCAL: THE LIFE AND WORK OF A REALIST. By Ernest Mortimer. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959. 249 pages. Cloth. \$4.00.

This, the latest in a long series of Pascal biographies, is a penetrating and conservative account of the man himself, written against the background of a valuable presentation of religious, philosophic, and scientific thought of his day. The author makes clear that Pascal was fully as significant as a scientist (for his discoveries, his inventions, and his stress on the inductive method) as he was as a religious thinker, and that even after he awakened to a deep interest in religion, his scientific interest never permanently waned. Mortimer traces the highly divergent sources of Pascal's thinking — Epictetus the Stoic, Jansen the Augustinian, and Montaigne the freethinker. Pascal never abandoned or depreciated reason in favor of faith; he merely insisted that their domains are completely separate. In the art of persuasion reason must be applied, and only one who thinks clearly and accurately can

convince others. Although he believed in orderly thinking, Pascal was convinced (against Descartes) that no man could draw a large-scale map of it. He also believed that there was a realm of truth which cannot be comprehended by analytical reasoning.

Mortimer writes in the finest British tradition of charm and elegance of style. As a result, his book is more than instructive; it is enjoyable. ROBERT D. PREUS

THE CAROLINE TRADITION OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND WITH PARCHURICULAR REFERENCE TO BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR. By F. R. Bolton. London: SPCK, 1958. xvi + 338 pages. Cloth. \$9.00.

The Church of Ireland, Bolton contends, "was never an offshoot or extension on Irish soil of the Church of England." It has, however, "made a rich contribution to the common Anglican heritage" (p. xiii). The Irish divines of the 17th century went back to early writers of the church. Ussher, for example, was an authority on Ignatius. They were not ready to follow the divines of the Roman Church. The particular contribution of Bolton's study, however, is his demonstration (for which the evidence seems adequate) that Bishop Jeremy Taylor is the author of the 1666 Irish Form and Order of Consecration of Churches. The entire study will be of value especially to students of Anglicanism. CARL S. MEYER

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL AND HIS NEW VERSION. By Cecil K. Thomas. Saint Louis: The Bethany Press, 1958. 224 pages. Cloth. \$4.00.

Thomas used his doctoral dissertation at Princeton Theological Seminary as the basis for this study. Scholarly, clear, well-organized, it has much to say to the student of the New Testament and to the church historian. Thomas is not content merely to discuss the New Version of 1826. He places

it into the context of its times, for Alexander Campbell was intent on bringing the Scriptures in the living language of his day. As editor, reviser, translator, promoter of the American Bible Union, scholar, frontier preacher, ecumenicalist, and the leading figure of the Disciples of Christ, Campbell is one of the foremost American churchmen of the first half of the 19th century. Thomas' study is valuable, too, because he presents Campbell's views on inspiration and his principles of Biblical interpretation. The Bethany Press, by publishing this work, has added another valuable volume to its Bethany History Series. CARL S. MEYER

TEN MEDIEVAL STUDIES. By G. G. Coulton. Boston: Beacon Press, 1959 (paperback edition). 297 pages. \$1.60. Appendices and Index.

This work of a noted authority on medieval history here becomes available as an inexpensive paperback; another of his works is on the way, *Inquisition and Liberty*. The ten studies were first published in 1906. There was an edition in 1915 and another in 1930. The 1930 edition carries studies which had gone out of print. Coulton is a controversial writer, defending the "moderate Anglican position" over against misrepresentations of "writers who disparage modern civilization," idealizing the medieval life. Interesting is an incident from pre-Reformation sources to refute the idealization of pre-Reformation religious education. "The curate of Sonning, who had been four years in priest's orders, was asked to construe the first words of the canon of the Mass—*Te igitur clementissime Pater*—'We pray Thee, therefore, most merciful Father,' etc. The report is he knew not the case of the word *Te*, nor by what it was governed; and having been bidden to look closely what part of the sentence could most properly govern *Te*, he replied: '*Pater*: for He governeth all things.' We asked him what *clementissime*

was, or what case, or how it was declined: he knew not. We asked him what was *clemens*: he knew not. Moreover [he knew no music and] knew by heart no part of the divine service or of the psalter. Moreover, he said that it seemed to him indecent to be examined by the dean, since he was already ordained. . . . He is sufficiently illiterate."

Coulton is rewarding reading for he uses almost exclusively orthodox pre-Reformation sources.

PHIL J. SCHROEDER

A WAY OF LIFE AND OTHER SELECTED WRITINGS OF SIR WILLIAM OSLER, 12 JULY 1849 TO 29 DECEMBER 1919. Edited by Alfred White Franklin. New York: Dover Publications, 1958. xx + 278 pages. Paper. \$1.50.

Canadian-born Sir William Osler has achieved almost legendary fame as a surgeon, first at Johns Hopkins, then, after nominal retirement, at Oxford. These products of his pen—reissued without change from the 1951 edition—reveal his broad culture, his almost British skill as an essayist, and his thorough competence as a historian. This reviewer recommends for reflection especially "Creators, Transmuters and Transmitters," "The Old Humanities and the New Science," and "Michael Servetus."

ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN

ORTHODOXY IN MASSACHUSETTS 1630—1650. By Perry Miller. Boston: Beacon Press, 1959. xxi + 324 pages. Paper. \$1.95.

When *Orthodoxy in Massachusetts* first came out in 1931, it represented a radically different approach to American colonial history. Three decades have paid Miller's scholarship the compliment of making his radically new approach almost conventional, although he still has—as he admits in his preface to this paperback edition—gainsayers. As for himself, he avers: "Since

1933 I have published many things which I regret, but in this case I find no reason to alter a word from the original phrases" (p. xix). Except, be it added, the bibliography, where the apparatus of doctoral scholarship has been replaced by an excellent "selective inventory of basic items, including later studies which have extended insights [Miller] chanced to attain in 1933." *Orthodoxy in Massachusetts* makes particularly salutary reading for Lutherans who may hold that a congregational polity has intrinsic spiritual superiority.

ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN

HOW WE GOT OUR DENOMINATIONS: A PRIMER ON CHURCH HISTORY. By Stanley I. Stuber. New York: Association Press, c. 1959. x + 254 pages. Cloth. \$3.50.

This is the most recent edition of a textbook for the laity, especially young people, that has been around in various editions for about a generation. It falls into roughly two equal divisions—three parts respectively on the early church (to 323), the ancient Catholic Church (to 1517), and the "Protestant Reformation," and a series of brief sketches of 13 contemporary American denominations, plus a 15-section chapter on "other important religious bodies" and another chapter on "Christian cooperation." Stuber has a gift for felicitous expression, and he is conscientiously determined to be scrupulously fair and objective. He does not escape serious error, however, either in his generalizations or in details. Here and there compression has led to unintelligibility; thus we are told that "in 1918 different factors united to form the United Lutheran Church in America, the most notable exception being the Augustana Synod and the Missouri Synod" (p. 182). The statement that "for the most part the Lutheran Church is congregational in polity" (p. 183) is true only of the New World. Lutherans will discover with aston-

ishment that one of their five "main convictions" is that "baptism affords the potential gift of regeneration from the Holy Spirit" (p. 184) and that "the Finnish Evangelical Church" is a part of the National Lutheran Council (p. 185). The undocumented quotation from "Dean Brown," to the effect that the Lutheran Church "does not allow 'the outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace' to interpose itself in any mechanical way between the heart of the communicant and the Real Presence of the Spirit of Christ abiding within the soul of the believer" (p. 184) — whatever, if anything, this sentence may mean — is at very best misleading. The bibliography is dated.

ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN

THE RENAISSANCE IDEA OF WISDOM.

By Eugene F. Rice, Jr. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958. xv + 220 pages. Cloth. \$4.75.

A history of the idea of wisdom in the years between Petrarca's exposition and Pierre Charron's treatise reveals that the concept became secularized. The medieval idea of wisdom was dominated by Augustine's conception, although Aquinas modified it somewhat. Nicholas of Cusa, in the late Middle Ages, pointed up the search for wisdom. Wisdom and piety were identical according to Petrarca, a *docta pietas*; in Salutati's definition it consisted of learning and virtue, an *eruditio moralis*. Bruni moved toward a secularized concept, but Filelfo was very close to Petrarca. Ficino and Pico della Mirandola and Landino were Platonists who stressed wisdom as "the knowledge of immutable, invisible, intelligible, and divine things." Cardinal Sadoleto differed with Tommaso Inghirami and with Sir Thomas Elyot. Bude and Celtis made their contributions to the idea of wisdom, as did Bovillus. The reformers, among them Colet and Luther and Calvin, emphasized the insufficiency of natural reason. Rice summarizes by saying

(p. 147): "The Reformation idea of wisdom has three fundamental characteristics. First, wisdom is an intellectual virtue, a form of knowledge, an attribute of the intellect rather than of the will. Second, because its content is Christian by definition, it is inseparable from Revelation. It is knowledge of divine things, understood as the Trinity and the *Credo*. Its source, finally, is wholly external to man; God as He reveals Himself in Scripture or by the direct action of grace." After the Reformation, however, the idea of wisdom was transformed by a moralizing process from knowledge to virtue. Louis Le Caron, Erasmus, Vives, among others, contributed to this process. Pierre Charron, however, in his *De la sagesse* [1601] successfully concluded the transformation of wisdom from contemplative knowledge to active virtue. This ideal remained as the dominant European ideal into the late 19th century.

Rice has shed light on the whole period from about 1350 to 1600 by this scholarly study. He does more than merely trace an idea; he vitalizes the thinking in one area of an era.

CARL S. MEYER

TWO JAPANESE CHRISTIAN HEROES.

By Johannes Laures. Rutland: Bridge-way Press, 1959. 128 pages. Cloth. \$2.50.

Laures has written an edifying book on two remarkable figures in Japan's "Christian century," the 16th. For Justo Takayama Ukon, a renowned feudal lord and general, he urges canonization. The other person is the renowned lady Gracia Hosokawa Tamako. Unlike thousands of other Japanese Christians, they did not obtain the coveted crown of martyrdom in a technical sense, yet their heroic faith and unflinching perseverance should be an inspiration to present-day missionaries, for they show the heights to which Japanese Christians at their best can rise.

WILLIAM J. DANKER

AFRICA: ITS PEOPLES AND THEIR CULTURE HISTORY. By George Peter Murdock. New York, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1959. 456 pages. Cloth. \$8.75.

Murdock has undertaken a Herculean task in giving an anthropological description of all the ethnic groups on the vast continent of Africa. He traces, *inter alia*, the diffusion of cultural traits through the trans-Saharan trade routes. The cultural impact of Indonesia from Madagascar to West Africa is not

overlooked nor the great expansion of the Bantu peoples.

This is a valuable reference book for anyone interested in Africa. The fold-out map of Africa giving the location of African tribes is of special importance as is the complete index of all the tribes that are treated in this very complete work. Necessarily the description of each tribe is brief, but a complete bibliography will guide the student to fuller information. This is the big picture.

WILLIAM J. DANKER

BOOKS RECEIVED

(The mention of a book in this list acknowledges its receipt and does not preclude further discussion of its contents in the Book Review section)

Nomina Sacra in the Greek Papyri of the First Five Centuries A.D.: The Sources and Some Deductions. By A. H. R. E. Paap. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959. 127 pages. Paper. 40 guilders.

Wort und Mystrium: Der Briefwechsel über Glaube und Kirche 1573 bis 1581 zwischen den Tübinger Theologen und dem Patriarchen von Konstantinopel, ed. the Ausenamt der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland. Witten: Luther Verlag, 1958. 300 pages. Cloth. DM 26.00.

Calwer Bibel-Lexikon, ed. Theodor Schlatter with Karl Gutbrod and Reinhold Küchlich. Lieferung 1: *A-Esra*. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1959. 288 columns. DM 7.50 per Lieferung.

La confirmation au cours des siècles: Contribution à débat sur le problème de la confirmation (Die Geschichte der Konfirmation: Ein Beitrag zur Diskussion über das Konfirmationsproblem). By Lukas Visscher, trans. J. Carrère. Paris: Editions Delachaux et Niestlé, 1959. 89 pages. Paper. Fr. Sw. 5.50.

Forerunners of Jesus. By Leroy Waterman. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959. xii + 156 pages. Cloth. Price not given.

Christian Beliefs: Fundamental Biblical Teachings for Seventh-Day Adventist College Classes. By T. H. Jamison. Mountain

View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1959. xi + 481 pages. Cloth. \$6.00.

Church Music and Theology. By Erik Routley. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959. 120 pages. Cloth. \$2.25.

Rabbinische Texte: Die Tosefta. Band VI: Seder Tobarot. Heft III: Abilot/Negaim. By Walter Windfuhr. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1959. xlviii + 16 pages. Paper. DM 6.00.

The Way of Wonder. By Marion Louise Bliss. New York: Vantage Press, 1960. 160 pages. Cloth. \$3.00.

Vacation Bible School Materials: Sample Kit. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1960. \$3.95.

A Pioneer in Northwest America 1841 to 1858: The Memoirs of Gustaf Unonius. Trans. from the Swedish by Jonas O. Backlund; ed. Nils W. Olsson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1960. vii + 357 pages. Cloth. \$7.50.

Schriftgebrauch, Schriftauslegung und Schriftbeweis bei Augustin. By Gerhard Strauss. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1959. vi + 160 pages. Paper. DM 12.00.

The Unity of Body and Mind (Innen und Aussen). By Lothar Bickel; trans. and ed. Walter Bernard. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959. 167 pages. Cloth. \$3.75.

The Cost of Discipleship (Nachfolge). By Dietrich Bonhoeffer; trans. Reginald H. Fuller. Revised and enlarged edition. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1959. 285 pages. Cloth. \$3.00.

Caspar Schwenckfeld on the Person and Work of Christ. By Paul L. Maier. St. Louis: The School for Graduate Studies, Concordia Seminary, 1959. 115 pages. Paper. \$2.00.

I Believe: The Personal Structure of Faith (Je Crois en Toi, structure personnelle de la foi). By Jean Mouroux, trans. Michael Turner. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1959. 109 pages. Cloth. \$2.75.

Viewpoints: Some Aspects of Anglican Thinking, ed. John B. Coburn and W. Norman Pittenger. Greenwich: The Seabury Press, 1959. xii + 267 pages. Cloth. \$5.00.

St. John Climacus: The Ladder of Divine Ascent, trans. Lazarus Moore. New York: Harper & Brothers [1959]. 270 pages. Cloth. \$5.00.

Modern Catholicism (Der moderne Katholizismus). By Walther von Loewenich, trans. Reginald H. Fuller. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1959. viii + 379 pages. Cloth. \$9.00.

Minister's Prayer Book: An Order of Prayers and Readings, ed. John W. Doberstein. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959. xxiv + 492 pages. Cloth. \$3.75.

A Lutheran Prayer Book, ed. John W. Doberstein. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1960. xi + 146 pages. Cloth. \$2.50.

Ökumene: Briefe, Aufsätze, Dokumente, 1928—42. By Dietrich Bonhoeffer, ed. Eberhard Bethge. Munich: Christian Kaiser Verlag, 1958. 550 pages. Paper, DM 19.00; cloth, DM 21.50.

Der Menschensohn in der synoptischen Überlieferung. By Heinz Eduard Tödt. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1959. 331 pages. Cloth. DM 9.80.

The Belief of Christendom: A Commentary on the Nicene Creed. By John Burnaby. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1959. 224 pages. Cloth. 17/6.

The Balanced Life: An Essay in Ethics. By Hans Freund. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959. 186 pages. Cloth. \$4.50.

Paulus: Die Theologie des Apostels im Lichte der jüdischen Religionsgeschichte. By Hans-Joachim Schoeps. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1959. xii + 324 pages. Cloth. DM 32.50.

Biblical Calendars. By J. Van Goudoever. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959. xii + 295 pages. Cloth. Gld. 18.00.

The Rule of God: Essays in Biblical Theology. By G. Ernest Wright. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, 1960. viii + 133 pages. Cloth. \$2.95.

Divorce. By Loraine Boettner. Rock Port, Mo.: The Author, 1960. 38 pages. Paper. 25 cents.

The Church's Ministry to the Older Unmarried. By M. D. Hugen. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1958. x + 122 pages. Paper. \$2.00.

The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness: A Vindication of Democracy and a Critique of Its Traditional Defense. By Reinhold Niebuhr. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1960. xv + 190 pages. Paper. \$1.25.

From Eden to Eternity: A Survey of Christology and Ecclesiology in the Old Testament and Their Redemptive Relationship to Man from Adam to the End of Time. By Howard A. Hanke. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1960. 196 pages. Cloth. \$3.50.

Lists of Words Occurring Frequently in the Hebrew Bible. By John E. W. Watts. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959. 31 pages. Paper. 75 cents.

The Little Flowers of Saint Francis, trans. L. Sherley-Price. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1959. 205 pages. Paper. 95 cents.

Christian Community. By J. V. Langmead Casserley. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1960. x + 174 pages. Cloth. \$5.00.

The Book of Genesis. By Ignatius Hunt. Part 2 with a commentary. New York: Paulist Press, 1960. 96 pages. Paper. 75 cents.

Christianity and Liberalism. By J. Gresham Machen. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, no date. 189 pages. Paper. \$1.75.

Gemeinde und Gemeindeordnung im Neuen Testament. By Eduard Schweizer. Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1959. 217 pages. Paper. Sw. Fr./DM 20.00.

Church Kingship and Lay Investiture in England 1089—1135. By Norman F. Cantor. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958. xiv + 349 pages. Cloth. \$6.00.

George Fox and the Quakers. By Henry Van Etten, trans. and rev. by E. Kelvin Osborn. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959. 191 pages. Paper. \$1.35.

The Learned Men. By Gustavus S. Paine. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1959. ix + 212 pages. Cloth. \$4.75.

Medieval Feudalism. By Carl Stephenson. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1956. xi + 116 pages. Paper. \$1.25.

Der Mensch zwischen zwei Welten: Der Dualismus der Texte von Qumran und der Damaskusfragmente. By Hans Walter Hupenbauer. Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1959. 132 pages. Paper. Sw. Fr./DM 18.00.

The Prophetic Voice in Modern Fiction. By William R. Mueller. New York: Association Press, 1959. 183 pages. Cloth. \$3.50.

Exploring Your Bible: A Comprehensive and Useful Handbook—A Complete Study-Method Manual. By John P. Oakes. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1960. 155 pages. Cloth. \$2.95.

The Minister and His Ministry. By Mark W. Lee. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1960. 280 pages. Cloth. \$3.95.

Revivals of the Old Testament. By C. E. Autrey. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1960. 160 pages. Cloth. \$2.95.

The Rise of Universities. By Charles Homer Haskins. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1957. xi + 107 pages. Paper. \$1.25.

The Satirical Letters of St. Jerome, trans. Paul Carroll. New York: Henry Regnery Company, 1956. xxviii + 198 pages. Paper. \$1.25.

Theology and Modern Literature. By Amos N. Wilder. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958. x + 145 pages. Cloth. \$3.00.

Die Verklärung Jesu: Historisches Ereignis und synoptische Berichte. By Hans Baltensweiler. Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1959. 150 pages. Paper. Sw. Fr./DM 18.00.

Zwinglis Lehre von der göttlichen und menschlichen Gerechtigkeit. By Heinrich Schmid. Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1959. 269 pages. Paper. Sw. Fr./DM 19.00.

And God Made Man and Woman: A Factual Discussion of Sex Differences. By Lucius F. Cervantes. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1959. xi + 275 pages. Cloth. \$4.00.

China: Lore, Legend and Lyrics. By R. de Rohan Barondes. New York: Philosophical Library, 1960. 238 pages. Cloth. \$4.75.

Evangelistic Sermons. By Charles H. Spurgeon. Selected and edited by Chas. T. Cook. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1959. New edition. 256 pages. Cloth. \$2.95.

Francisco Romero on Problems of Philosophy. By Marjorie S. Harris. New York: Philosophical Library, 1960. 113 pages. Cloth. \$3.75.

A History of Greece to 322 B.C. By N. G. L. Hammond. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959. xiv + 689 pages. Cloth. \$8.00.

Ideas of Revelation: An Historical Study A.D. 1700 to A.D. 1860. By H. D. MacDonald. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1959. xi + 300 pages. Cloth. \$6.75.

Liturgical Retreat. By Roy Howard. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1959. xii + 145 pages. Cloth. \$3.00.

Post-Reformation Spirituality (De la Dévotion moderne à la Spiritualité française). By Louis Cognet; trans. P. Hepburne Scott. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1959. 143 pages. Cloth. \$2.95.

Sermons on Prayer. By Charles H. Spurgeon. Selected and edited by Chas. T. Cook. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1959. 256 pages. Cloth. \$2.95.

The Spiritual Gospel: The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church. By M. F. Wiles. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1960. x + 182 pages. Cloth. \$4.75.

ignis
tens-
150

und
nrich
269

Fac-
ucius
Com-
4.00.
t. de
hical
5.

H.
T.
hing
ages.

philo-
ork:
ges.

N.
Uni-
oth.

udy
lac-
59.

ew
45

Dé-
(e).
ott.
43

ar-
ok.
se,

on
b.
ge
es.